

M E D I O C R I A:
OR THE
Middle Way
BETWEEN
P R O T E S T A N T and P A P I S T:
In a PAPER of
J U S T I F I C A T I O N.

By JOHN HUMFRET

The Second Edition, with Additions, and a Letter
to Mr. Williams.

Of the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, as if we had performed it all; and of Faith, whose office it is to embrace that Righteousness so imputed, there is not one word in the Sacred Letters. *Grosius.*

I cannot but with a Sounder Judgment to some who in these our times have troubled many with this paradox; that we are saved by Faith alone: when yet they saw this was so interpreted, as if they did define Righteousness by the sole opinion, or persuasion of the mind, and did exclude good Works. What Charity now is that which doth not vouchsafe one word to cure this Malady, by saying, We are justified by Faith, formed, or consummate; or by Faith, we attain a willingness to do good Works, and so attain unto Righteousness, or Faith is the Foundation and Root of a good Life, as *Austin* said? Nor is any Man verily to be offended with the truth. *Bucer.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for C. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three
Crowns, in Cheap-side, 1695.

W. P. 1000

The Bookseller to the Reader.

Reader,

THere was several Papers of Mr. H. Entitled, The Middle way (or mediocria) and one of the same nature called Peaceable Disquisitions, which I printed long since, at several times ; the first whereof, was of Justification (about a Year or two before any of the rest) ; the Impression whereof, going off wholly and quickly, I have been sought to for that Paper often, but could gratifie no Gentleman or Customer with it, they being so long sold : Knowing now, what a stir of late hath been, and is, made about this Point, and that Mr. H. did use another sort of liberty of Thought than others do, in his writing of it ; which liberty then was well taken, and no man offended, or writ against it (the things he offer'd, he presenting (he said) by way of Essay, when a more accurate composure (he judg'd) would but take off from that which is native in them) ; I have thought good, it being moved so me, to Reprint that Paper of Justification, (the first impression being three or four and Twenty Years ago) and the rather, because some Notions, which have spread abroad since in others books, do (it is supposed) owe their Original to this Paper ;

The Book-Seller to the Reader.

to which, you shall have the addition also of those further Reflexions on the Point, which he made in his others which ensued, as so many more blows on the same Iron while hot, being so hard to yield. I will presume to say no more, but commit the Reader to the judgment hereupon of two Men, whose Testimony, while living, does bespeak his more attentive reading and considerations.

To Mr. J. H.

I Thank you for your Book. I think by studying of the Scripture, and things more than what others have said before you, you have escap'd the Temptations to siding and partiality: And I think you have hit on many considerable Truths, which many over-look; and improve many which some do lightly pass over:

Richard Baxter.

I am of the same mind,

Tho. Manton, D. D.

Of Justification.

IT is a trouble to me often, in reading Polemical Divinity, to see how Men that walk in a vain shew to others, and disquice themselves in vain, are governed by Prejudice and Party: It is a hard thing many times, and a Man must be very witty, and strain himself to pick a fault in his Adversary, for matter of contention, when a little pains only to understand him, and the least candour, or, but a bare equality, in the interpretation, would bring him whether he would or no, almost, to reconciliation. The truth is, the Papists do abuse the Protestants, and the Protestants abuse the Papists, and that is the sum of many of our great Controversies. I judge the like between Arminian and Calvinists, and other Contenders. If *Luther* hath said it, or *Calvin* hath said it, it must be *Heretical*: and if the Council of *Trent* have delivered it, or *Bellarmino* said so, it must be dangerous, it favours of the *Harlot*, it is the *Abominable Doctrine of the Church of Rome*. Amongst the many contests between this Church and us, there are few which are carried on with that affection and concernment, as the dispute of Justification. *St Paul* was the first that engaged upon this point, and not without some warmth against those that opposed him. *St James* is the next that hath spoken of this Subject. The Primitive Church and the Fathers after them have accorded pretty well with both; but the School-men, as I take it, by pressing some passages of the Fathers over-closely, having obscured the *grace of the Gospel*, our Protestant Churches have risen up as it were under the *Standard of St Paul*, that is *under his words*, and the Roman Church under the words of *St James*, and come out into a set Battle, which serving only to raise up *dust, darkness and doubt* among the most, it is a conference I count between the *Leaders*, I mean a plain understanding or adjustment only of the one united certain sense of both *Apostles*, inspired by the same holy Spirit, that will, that must, and does give light to the intelligent and impartial, to uncloud the errors on each side, and end the quarrel.

The word *justify* is from the word *just*, and one may be said

to be made or rendred just, by *infusion*, or by *plea*. Our Protestant Divines do all teach us that the word is a forensical term, and is to be understood in opposition to *Condemnation*, for which they have good Scripture; the Papists do tell us, that to justify a sinner, is to make him righteous, and understand by it, in effect, the same thing with *Sanctification*. St *Augustine*, it must be acknowledged, hath lead them this way. *Gratificavit nos in dilecto, gratificavit a gratia, sicut justificavit a justitia. De bono perseverantiae, c. 6. Christus justificat impium faciendo ex impio Christianum. Christ does justify the ungodly, by making him of one that is wicked, a holy man, or a Christian, Contra literas Petiliani l. 3. c. 45.* There is his book *De spiritu & litera*, where he hath the same up, and from whence a Man may pick out his judgment on this point, rather than any where else that I know. I did expect to find more, *De fide & operibus*, but I perceive it does mainly respect another matter: we may see also his Book, *De libero arbitrio & gratia*. The judgment then of this Father which leads the Schools in their disputes about these matters, as to the main, comes to this. That God of his own goodness only, or free will, to wit, according to Election, does vouchsafe the Holy Spirit to some Persons, who does infuse his Grace in their hearts; which Grace is that which disposes them to all righteousness, and is the same according to him, otherwhere with *Charity*, which fulfils the Law, and so justifies us. And in this sense does he tell us, that, *Bona opera sequuntur justificationem, non precedunt justificandum. Good works do follow the Person justified, and do not go before justification.* The meaning whereof with him is, that we must first have this Grace infused (which habitually inclines to our whole duty both unto God and to our Neighbour), that is, the making the ungodly a just Man, before he can do any thing that is good. *Pelagius* Doctrine was, that Grace is given according to our Merits; but St *Augustines* Doctrine is, that Grace is first given, and good works follow.

When the Apostle then does tell us that we are justified by *grace*, this Father I say understands by it this infused grace, that is, an habit of righteousness infused into the heart, for fulfilling the Law of God, and so justifies. *Lex data est ut quaeretur gratia, gratia data est, ut lex impleatur. The law is given that grace may be sought, and grace is given that the law may be fulfilled. De spir. & lit. c. 19.* In correspondence to this, when the Apostle says we are justified by faith, he tells us, that it is by its *impetration of this grace*.

grace. *Impetrat orando*, he has it in another place. Faith carries us to God, when we cannot fulfill his Commandments our selves, and by the infusion of this habit he enables us to do it, and thereby are we justified in his Opinion. *Quod opus lex minando imperat, hoc fidei lex credendo impetrat. Lege operum dicit Deus fac quod jubet: lege fidei dicitur Deo da quod jubes.* That which the law of works requires by threats, the law of faith obtains by believing. In the law of works, God says, do what I command: in the law of faith, we say to God, give what thou commandest. *Ib. c. 12. Opus quod qui fecerit vivet in eo, non sit nisi justificato: justificatio autem ex fide impetratur.* The works which he that does shall live in them, are not done but by the justified: and justification is impetrated by faith. *c. 19. Lex non evanescit sed statuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam qua lex impleatur.* The law is not made void, but established by faith, because faith fetches from God his grace, whereby the law is fulfilled. *c. 30.* Now when he accounts that this grace which makes us just, or this infused grace is obtained by faith, it is plain, that he must account that good works do follow it. Upon which there is a difficulty might be proposed to this Father. The spirit infuses this grace: does faith then precede the spirit that infuses it, or not? If it do, then must our faith be of our selves, when our good works are of his gift. And this indeed was his judgment, while he wrote this book, tho after he recalled it in others. See particularly *De gra. & lib. arb. c. 5.* Where he is proving that our conversion, and so faith it self is from God.

To go on, when the Apostle does oppose this faith and grace unto works, he is put to it; for, when by grace he understands nothing but infused righteousness for the fulfilling the law, how does that oppose works? For the making his notion hold therefore, by works in opposition to grace and faith, he understands *Opera sine adjutorio & dono Dei*, works without the assistance and gift of God. In short, our justification is not of works, which are done before we have grace; but of works which proceed from it. *Israel non pervenit ad justitiam, quare? quia non ex fide sed tanquam ex operibus: id est, tanquam eam per semet ipsos operantes, non in se credentes operari Deum.* Israel attained not to righteousness, why? because he sought it not of faith, but as it were of works: that is, as working it out of themselves, and not believing in God to work it in them. *Ib. c. 19. Sg, De gra. & lib. arb. c. 8. Quomodo non ex operibus ne forte quis extollatur! audi & intellige, non ex operibus*

dictum tanquam tuis ex te ipso tibi existentibus, sed tanquam his in quibus te Deus finxit. Ipsius enim figmentum sumus creati in Christo Jesu in operibus bonis. How, not of works that one may not boast? hear and understand, it is said not of works as thy own; done by thee of thy self: but of those as in which thou art created by God, for we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works. Again, Ignorantes Dei justitiam, id est, quæ ex Deo est homini ut sit justus: & suam volentes constituere, tanquam per eorum non adjutum divinitus arbitrium lex possit impleri. Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum. l. 3. c. 1. Being ignorant of the righteousness of God, that is, which comes from God to man, to make him righteous; and being willing to establish their own, that is, as if by their own free-will without the divine help, they were able to perform the law.

In this doctrine of the Father, there are three things wherein he is out.

The first is in his conception of *Grace*. When *works* and *grace* are opposed, we are not to apprehend with him, that *grace* is taken for any thing infused in the Soul, which is inherent grace; for *works* and *grace* in this sense have no opposition, the one being the fruits of the other. But by *grace*, we must understand the grace of God without us, the grace which is in God, that is, his favour, or the condescension of God to us in this matter. And thus is the opposition very plain. That which is of *debt* is one thing, and that which is of *favour* another. Not of *works*, that is, not of debt, or of what would make the reward to be due: but of *grace*, that is, when it is not due, but of favour. The certain truth is this, God Almighty gave to man a law according to his nature, which he repeated to the Jews, and if any man were able to keep this law according to the covenant of Nature, then should his justification be of *right* and *due*, according to the law of his creation; but the Apostle does most industriously prove, that neither Jew nor Gentile was able to produce these *works*, and consequently if there be any, whether Jew or Gentile that are justified, it must be by *grace*, because it cannot be of *right*, or what he may challenge by the law upon that account. Grace then, and mark it well, is the accepting of any mans person, or thing which is done, when one may choose, or when in justice one were not bound to do it. Accordingly, when God justifies us by grace, it is his accepting of us as righteous, or of what we do, for righteousness, and

and rewarding it as such; when according to his law it would not stand, but he might condemn us for it. Let any who have better words use them, I regard only my sense. And here may we have an answer to a question of great heat amongst our Divines. The Gospel requires Faith, Repentance, and new Obedience, and how then are we justified and saved by *grace*, or how then is *grace* free, when it is not vouchsafed but upon *conditions*? This difficulty hath made some run into that extream, that the Covenant of grace is without condition: but I say readily, the grace of God, or of the Gospel is *free*, in that he accepts of the sinners faith and repentance, when he needs not, or when according to the *Law*, he is not tyed to it, unless mans obedience were perfect. That which our Divines do offer usually is this: It is free because it is not of merit, mans belief and obedience cannot merit any thing at the hands of God, and much less Salvation, as well from the disproportion of our performances, or momentary sufferings, to the eternal weight of glory, with other the like reasons, as that we do herein but our duty, and he helps us also in the doing, which are the chief reasons that are urged.

This information does labour I think with some defect of light. If man had performed the condition of the Covenant of works, it might upon these reasons have been said, that life and salvation, had been still of *grace* and *free*, as not merited, while these considerations hinder merit: whereas the Apostle industriously opposing the sinners being justified, or saved freely by Gods grace, to justification by works, or the deeds of the law, does account, if man were justified by *works*, it would be of *debt*. Could a man (I say) have performed the condition of the Covenant of Nature, the Apostle accounts still in his reckoning that then had the reward been of *debt* or *merit*, and if a mans own Conscience could not accuse him of sin, he had no need of *grace*: but now sayes he, seeing both *Jew* and *Gentile* fall short hereof, and all are become guilty before God, there is none, is, or can be justified, but it must be *gratis*, freely in opposition to that performance. To lend more help against this difficulty we must distinguish of merit. There is a debt or merit of *Commutative* justice or of governing *Distributive* justice. It is impossible that any should engage the Almighty in a debt of the former sort. Of the latter sort, there is a debt or merit upon *Compact*, or upon *strict Retaliation*. It is true, that there is nothing man does, or could do in the state of innocency, had

had he continued perfect, *can merit* or could have merited any reward from God, upon the score of a *strict Retaliation*, any more than upon *Commution* justice, there being nothing we do worthy our Governour, besides we neither *benefit*, or *hurt* him: and so these reasons before named of our Divines and others, may come in if they please. *Can a man be profitable to God*, sayes *Eliphaz* to *Job*? And, *who hath given to the Lord that he should receive of him*, sayes the *Apostle*? But the case is not so (under their favour) with a debt, or merit upon *Compact*. A compact then may be twofold. Upon terms that are equal: and upon terms unequal. In a compact upon terms that are equal, we are to know that the reward does become debt, or may be said to be of merit, notwithstanding by way of *strict retaliation*, or upon an account of equal benefit, the performance of the condition would require no such matter. For instance, if I agree to give a man half a crown for his dayes work, I must pay it him as *debt*, though the emolument to me by the work done, is not worth it, nay, though if I had not agreed, I should have thought much to give him half the money: but in a compact upon terms unequal, as if I promise a poor man a shilling for his leading my horse to the next stile, though I am bound to give it to him when he has done so, yet is the shilling an *Almes*, or the reward of *grace*, (or favour) for all that. Now I account when God in the covenant of Nature, hath made eternal life to be due upon exact obedience, it is a compact upon terms but equal, he that doth them, shall live in them. So long as man was innocent, God in justice could not punish him: and so long as he continued but in the same state he was created, he must be happy, and eternally so, which is the same thing with *Salvation*, only it could not be called by that name, till man was first *lost*. Neither may Gods giving him ability, or his doing no more than his duty, be any hindrance to him of meriting upon this compact, any more than my letting the man I have hired, to work with my shovel or mattock, and his doing only what he was bid, hinder him of his wages: the reason is, because the compact supposes that if he does but his duty, with the strength that God has given, or does give him, he shall be justified and blessed. If *Adam* then had, or we could perform the condition of *Nature*, which is to live perfectly without offending God at all, the reward no doubt (seeing the *Apostle* so accounts of it) should be of merit or debt, for that was a covenant upon terms but equal, it being meet that God should deal benignly

benignly with us as his *Creatures*, while we carry out selves for-
wards him as our *Makers*; and that he should not deprive us of any
benefit; to which we were *created*, before we forfeited it by our
transgression. But now when he gives us the reward, which is *et-
ernal life through his Son*, upon an obedience which is imperfect
(that is by a new Covenant upon terms *unequal*) he gives it *freely*,
seeing he gives it without performance of the conditions first re-
quired to obtain the same. The sum of this is, that the *Rational* ju-
stice of God is either under the *strict law*, or under the *law of grace*.
When our Divines then say that our works do not merit, they say
true, but they must be rightly understood: when they give us
those reasons for it, at first named, their reasons are good against
all merit of *Commutative justice*, and of *strict retaliation* in *Di-
stributive justice*, and against merit *ex pacto* under the *strict law*, or
upon terms that are equal; but as to a merit of compact under the
law of grace, *secundum regimen gratiae paternum*, they are not good.
When by some of these reasons therefore, our works, if they were
perfect should not yet be meritorious, which is a contradiction to
the Apostle, I must conclude that the reason why grace is said to
be free by *St. Paul*, is not because our works do not merit upon
their reasons, or do not merit with a merit of *strict retaliation*,
or *ex pacto*, upon terms that are equal, which their reasons only ex-
clude; but because we do not come up to those (those works),
which notwithstanding their reasons, would merit if we did per-
form them; that is, because they come short of that condition,
which by Gods first compact according to *Nature*, should make the
reward to be of debt, and yet God accepts of them for Christs
sake, and rewards them no less than if they did. That the grace
of justification is purchased by Christ, it is apparent in the words
that are ordinarily joyned with it, *Being justified freely by his grace
through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*. But if the notion of
free did lye in the conception our Divines ordinarily frame, then
could it not be the fruit of Christs purchase, for how can that
which is *purchased*, in their sense be *free*? whereas it is this grace
certainly, is the main fruit of Christs redemption, to wit, that the
new Covenant should be established, so as the poor sinner whose
Conscience does condemn him of the breach of that law, which
is *written in his heart*, and according to which he should dye, hath
yet a refuge to God's mercy, which he is said, *Let pray pardon me
the repetition*, to bestow *freely*, because man hath not the works
which

which should make the reward due to him. Lo then how the grace of God is said *free* indeed in the meaning of the Apostle. Not upon the account, I say, that man *cannot merit at Gods hand*, (though it be true that *our works do not merit*) as our Divines ordinarily only inform us, seeing both that God can be made debtor, *ex pacto, regimine gratia paterno*, and Christ who became man did merit for us: but upon the account here mentioned; which is a most direct answer to the doubt proposed, how the grace of God can be free, which is not tendred and obtained but upon condition; and I declare that Gods abatement of the terms, and requiring a *new* condition is that which therefore makes it free, seeing it is tendred and obtained without performance of the *old*. As also that the new being *unequal*, hinders not *grace*.

The second thing wherein St *Austin* is out, is in his interpretation of *Works*. It is manifest that *Paul* speaks of works in such a sense, as no man living can perform them, and upon that account no man can be justified by them. But if the interpretation of this Father, and the Papists after him were true, that by works we must understand works only that are done before a man is regenerate, or before he hath the help of the spirit, then may a man who is regenerate, and hath its help, perform the works that the Apostle speaks of, and so be justified by them. And then must his doctrine be false that comes to this universal conclusion. *Wherefore we conclude that by the works of the law shall no flesh living be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin.* On the other side, when some Protestants conceive that the Apostle speaks of our works in general, and accounts that we are not justified by them, because it is by the *righteousness of Christ* that we are justified, I cannot but think they are out likewise. For if when *Paul* says we are not justified by *works*; his meaning were, not by our *own works*, but by the *obedience of Christ* wrought for us: then when *James* says we are justified by *works*, his meaning must be by the *works Christ did for us*, and he must not mean our *own*. But this is absouant to any rational apprehension to construe St *James* so. Nor do I think such a meaning ever came into the heads of either of the Apostles. Our Divines then should not say here of our works in general, but as to the sense the Apostle speaks of them in general, we are not justified by them. And what is that sense then in which he speaks of *works*; why he speaks of works in that sense most manifestly as the *law* requires them, *that we may live in them*.

them. Let a man then have the help of the spirit, or be without it, so long as he falls short of what the law requires at his hands, be it never so little, he cannot *live* by those works; the curse is due to him for the least breach, and that is contrary to justification. There are some Divines of note therefore, seeing no footing for this distinction, have chose an other. There are works of the *Law* (say they :) and works of the *Gospel*. When St *Paul* sayes we are not justified by *works*, he speaks expressly of *works of the Law*: St *James* is to be understood of the *works of the Gospel*. This distinction may serve well, provided it to be cloathed with the sense of the Apostles. When some have used these terms to signify no more but that we are not justified by Jewish observations, but by the righteousness of the Gospel, it falls too short in the first branch to do any thing. But by the *works of the law* let them understand *works which answer the law*, and that there are none justified by the *works of the Law*, because there is none perfectly fulfil it, and they have hit the business. For though *Paul* speaks not only of works by the law of innocency, but directly and mostly of the works of the Jewish law, which the Jews fancied, *ex sufficientia & praestantia legis*, did as such, procure pardon and life, without looking to the merits of the Mediator for it, and so erred: yet the law of *Moses* consisting either in *moral* precepts that represented the law of Nature which no man can come up to, and the most righteous of them did break: or in the remedying commandments of sacrifices or attonements for sin, whose virtue alone did lye in the blood of the Redeemer: the ground & bottom of their error which he confuteth does indeed lye herein; seeing that (*N.B.*) whatsoever it was they did, or whatsoever they thought of it, it did fall short of the law of works, and therefore did not justify them before God. There are works then which if they be performed do *answer the Law*, the law we are to mean ultimately as given to mankind in a Covenant by our creation: and works which if performed do *not answer the Law*, but answer the *Gospel*. If the distinction before-cited be received with this meaning, it is true that *Paul* speaks of the works of the *Law*, and *James* of the works of the *Gospel*; and that there is no man justified by the *former*, because there is no man does or can perform them, when we do perform the *latter* and are justified by them. To give more light and weight to this. There are works which if we be justified by them exclude grace: and there are works which exclude not grace though we be justified by them. The works of the law, take

them in this sense, that answer the law if they be performed, must make justification due so as it may be challenged according to the law; the reward shall be of debt, and there be no need of grace but justice in the case, for he that doth them ought of right to *live in them*. And these are the works undoubtedly that *Paul* disputes against, while he proves justification to be of grace; which is also agreeable to the end and scope the holy Ghost seems to have in it, to wit, the beating man down from all vain exaltation in himself, and laying him at Gods feet for all he has. Wherein it were not yet enough that what he hath received, seeing he would be even ready to boast of this, that he hath received what others have not: but that when he is enabled by God to perform that which he does, even this which he hath received, and is accepted, is but such as God Almighty might choose whether he would accept it or not, and if it were not for *grace*, for all he hath done, he could not yet be justified and saved. On the contrary hand therefore, the works of the Gospel, that is the works which the Gospel requires of us as the condition of our justification and Salvation, such as faith, repentance, and new obedience, when they are performed, and answer the Gospel, they do yet stand in need of grace, because they do not answer the law, and God might chuse whether he would accept them or no, or make any promise to them. When we repent, it includes the acknowledgment of sin, and when we believe, it is a flying to Gods mercy for it, and though we may walk *sincerely* before God, we do not, and cannot walk *perfectly*, and he might condemn us in justice for the least failings, and much more for our manifold transgressions. If God then shews mercy, and accepts of what we do, it must be of his grace that he does it. It is true that these works do justify us, but that is while we are judged at the bar of Gods grace, or according to the new Covenant, which is therefore called a covenant of grace, or the law of grace, because that grace is no wayes destroyed, but confirmed by these works. From whence it may appear that the two Apostles shall be so far from contradicting one another about this point, as that, what St *Paul* contends for, shall be made good by that which is said by St *James*. *Paul* sayes we are justified by grace, and St *James* proves it, while he shews us that our works which are *imperfect* (even such as *Rahabs* as well as *Abrahams*) are accepted and rewarded as if they were *perfect*, that is, are *imputed* to us for *righteousness*, which they could never be but for *grace*, and that purchased through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.

The

The third thing wherein St. *Augustine* mistakes, is that which strews the way to the Papists doctrine of justification by works: and therefore it will be necessary before I come to it, to advance here something out of this Father which offers us I think some light towards the fixing our own doctrine of justification by faith. *Per legem cognitio peccati: per fidem impetratio gratia contra peccatum: per gratiam sanatio animi a vitio peccati: per animi sanitatem libertas arbitrii: per liberum arbitrium iustitia dilectio: per iustitia dilectionem legis impletio.* De spir. & lit. c. 30. By the law we have the knowledge of sin: by faith we impetrate Gods grace against sin: by grace the Soul is healed from corruption: by that healing we have liberty of will: by this liberty we come to love righteousness: by the love of righteousness we perform or fulfil the law, and so are justified. Faith then does justify according to him, as *exordium hujus ad salutem connexionis* (so he expresses it c. 31.) as the beginning work that brings on the rest which follow in this connexion, or as the foundation link in this chain of our salvation. That we may be sure of his judgment herein, this must not go without some quotation from one of his latter books also. *Ex fide autem ideo disci justificari hominem, non ex operibus, quia ipsa prima datur, ex qua impetrentur cetera, qua proprie opera nuncupantur, in quibus iuste vivitur.* De prædicatione sanctorum. l. 1. c. 7. The Apostle faith a man is justified by faith and not by works, because it is faith that is first given, from whence they follow, or by which the grace of God to lead a holy life is obtained. And unto this will I add the suffrage yet of a greater Author, the Son of St. *rach.* Faith is the beginning of cleaving to God.

There may be here therefore two questions, *de fide, Quæ justificat, and quæ iustificat.* What faith it is that justifies us? and, how faith justifies us?

For the former it is agreed easily. That faith which *worketh by love*, as St. *Paul* speaks, or that faith which is *made perfect by works* as St. *James* speaks, and no other, is that which justifies us. There are some Divines make faith a complex thing to comprehend repentance and obedience under it. Faith, say they, is the receiving Christ both as Saviour and Lord, or the receiving him upon the terms of the Gospel; and it is no wonder if they say faith alone justifies us, when this faith alone is no less with them than the whole condition which the Gospel requires of us to our justification. Others do distinguish faith, repentance, and obedience,

and say, that it is not *faith* alone, but *repentance* and *new obedience* also is required to justify us. And both these sorts of Divines say but the same thing in effect, and agree in their meaning. When the Scripture therefore says, *If thou believest thou shalt be saved, or if thou repentest thou shalt be saved*; Bellarmine says such Texts must be understood with the supposition, *si cetera adhibeantur*, that is, if that which is required also elsewhere is supplied. Thou shalt be saved if thou repentest, provided thou also believest; and if thou believest thou shalt be saved, provided also thou repentest and walkest sincerely before God. I mean, provided thou resolves upon a changed upright life, and if thou art not prevented, bringest this resolution to practise, there being no doubt but if a man dye before opportunity, his consent to the covenant is to be reckoned for obedience, and baptism always washes away sins with the Fathers. *Non concluditur legitime* (says a Judicious Protestant Divine) *a positione unius disparati ad negationem alterius: neque ab eo quod aliquot locis docetur, ad negationem eorum quae alibi asseruntur.* We may not argue from the position of one thing, to the negation of another which is but diverse, and not contrary to it, nor from the assertion of one thing as some places of Scripture, to the denial of any thing else which is asserted also in others. And this I take to be more after St. Austin and St. James, who do both methinks make faith the *initium & fundamentum* (to use his words) the foundation and entrance to obedience and good works, and so to justify us as it is productive of them. We shall reconcile all I hope if we say only, that faith indeed may be distinguished, when not divided from our obedience in our justification. That is, in short, *faith*, is one thing, and *justifying faith* is another, and yet justifying faith retain the common nature still of *faith*. Justifying faith, I take it, is such a believing of, or trusting to Gods mercy, that he will pardon our sins if we repent and walk sincerely before him (which are the terms obtained for us through Christs redemption), as produces that repentance and sincere walking. It is such an assent to what God reveals, as carries the heart and life along with it. I believe his promises (to wit effectually) when I so trust them, as to do the things he requires of me to obtain them. I believe his precepts when I keep them. I believe his threats, when I abstain from the evil he forbids, to avoid them. I believe the Gospel, when I become Christs Disciple. *Credere est fideliter esse* according to Salvian, & to be faith-

faithful, is to do our duty. *Well done good and faithful servant.*

For the latter, I do not apprehend seriously (if I may speak freely my thoughts, to which very end do I write) but that there is a great deal more stir and difference among Divines in this point of *justification by faith* than needs in late times. If any man might meerly by his believing Christ dyed for him, and hath carried away all sin, be justified and saved, let him live as he list holding still but this perswasion, there were something in our contending for justification by faith alone, and a man would not be bereaved of the comfort of such a doctrine for the World. But when we all agree that whether good works do justify or no, good works in the *resolution*, and *practice*, if not prevented, are necessary some way or other; so that no man living ever was, or can be justified that is destitute of them. I doubt me verily our contention in this matter is rather *curious* than *profitable*, in shewing how faith *without works*, but not a faith, *which is without works* (at least in the will and intention) does justify. I know our Divines against the Papists contend that faith justifies in *sensu correlativo*, or in regard of the object, so as to be justified by Christs blood, and by faith is all one, that is, by faith in his blood. The righteousness of Christ imputed is the *formal*, say some, or as others had rather say, the *material* cause of our justification, and faith justifies as an instrument. For my own part I will tell you therefore what I have sometimes set down for truth in my *contending belief*, and what I think in my cold *practical conceit* of the point.

As for my younger thoughts I have sometimes pitched them thus. Justifying faith is the *receiving act* of a *working habit*, as hath the other act too to put forth upon trial, or else it is but a *dead faith*. Now this faith I have counted justifies as an *instrument*, not *mans*, who doth not justify himself, but *Gods* instrument though mans act. This I have made out to my self thus. Unto justification there goes *two things*, the *imputation* of Christs righteousness for the discharge of sin, and accepting us unto life; and a *valid donation* of it to the sinner. The last is the ground of the former; for man must be *made just*, or God cannot reckon him so, and acquit him in judgment. *The judgment of God is according to truth.* Now to this making a man just, as there is this *donation* of God, there must be *mans receiving*, Christ is not ours though tendered or given untill we receive him. This receiving then (which is our act, that is faith it self) God excites, and make use of to this end. He makes

makes use of it (I have accounted) as his instrument of making Christ ours, to this end he hath appointed it for, that he may accordingly reckon his righteousness to us, unto the remission of sin and everlasting salvation.

Having told you this first, I may make the bolder to tell you my more indifferent thoughts of farther years. I do apprehend that the Apostles in their doctrine, and the Primitive Christians, had more simple and less intricate conceptions of things than we have; and that their dispute then whether we are justified by faith or works, in the most simple understanding of it, contains no more than to shew us what is required of persons that they may be justified, or what is that God hath made the condition on our parts of our justification. St *Augustine* I have said, does teach us that faith does justify us as the beginning and foundation unto grace and a good life, and the Council of *Trent* with *Bellarmino*, and the Papists after that Council stand upon this. Faith justifies only as *initium justificationis*, the beginning of justification. But howsoever the Papists have made use of that Father, the truth and light which he hath offered, is not to be lost; I do take this to be the most right and certain notion that faith does justify as *initium* and *fundamentum*; I will not say *justificationis*, seeing I understand not justification to be all one with sanctification as they do, but as *fundamentum conditionis*. The condition of our full and final justification the Gospel offers, is repentance and sincere obedience, and faith is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of that condition. Was not Abraham our Father justified by works when he had offered his Son Isaac, says St *James*? The faith of Abraham or his believing God, was the beginning and foundation of this excellent work, the ready offering his Son, which shewed his sincerity of life, the condition of justification. And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. Here believing and offering of Isaac are all one with St *James*. The offering Isaac proceeded from believing, as the *initium* and *fundamentum* of it, and so believing as the *initium* of sincerity of life or sincere obedience does justify. Such a faith as produces good works which are sincere tho' imperfect, or such good works as proceed from faith, are but one and the same thing with the two Apostles, and made by both, the condition of our justification.

And here I should be willing to come off: but the uniform judgment of the reformed Churches on the Article of Justification requires

quires some regard. There is therefore in the Schools, a *Quatenus specificative*, & *reduplicative*. I suppose when I have said that faith does justify us as the foundation of the condition (and so productive of the whole of it) I have said well with St *Augustine* as to the *quatenus specificative*, and if I said nothing else it might be enough. Nevertheless, seeing it is but fit upon this account to speak yet a little more curiously, I must needs say farther, that I apprehend there is indeed something really in that which lyes in the concurring thoughts of our Divines, that faith hath, and must have a hand in our justification some way, as no other of our works or acts have. It is this. I believe that God will pardon me if I repent, and therefore I repent, as my faith now makes me repent and perform the condition, it justifies me, as to a *quatenus specificative* but when I have repented and performed the condition, the duties I have performed are imperfect and sinful, and have need of mercy in point of law, and it is my faith yet must go to God for his acceptance of them through Christ when I have done. It is my faith, let me say, that must make up to me, out of the mercy or grace of God for Christs sake, what is wanting in that I have done to make it such as he may impute it to me for righteousness, which else he could not. And as faith procures me this, or procures it thus, we have the *quatenus also reduplicative*, in the great question how faith justifies. It is faith makes me perform the condition, and then finds acceptance for it being done; and as it does both, it does *specificative*, and *reduplicative* justify the sinner. By this, it appears, how faith hath an eye still to pardon according to the Protestant, while it is opposed to works in the point of justification, which is not only as respecting the pardon of all our sins upon the performing the condition: but as respecting that pardon more especially which goes into the very accepting the condition performed; for when there is imperfection still in our duty, and yet he accepts it, he must pardon also, what he accepts. And thus it is that the *just man* is said to *live by faith* in the most subtle conception. The works which the just man does are *his righteousness* most certainly, and that which justifies him; but they are short, and he could not *live* in them, but that faith supplies (as I speak) out of Gods pardon and grace, and consequently out of the Covenant for Christs sake, what is wanting otherwise for acceptation unto life. I do not say faith supplies this out of Christs merits, as if *his* and *our* obedience were mingled, to make up that *one* righteousness that justifies

fies us: but that it is our works which we perform our selves thro' the spirit, is the condition, and through Christs merits, both the imperfection is pardoned, and they accepted, according to covenant, upon faith. *It is of faith* says St Paul, *that it might be of grace.* To be of *works*, is to need no grace; but to be of *faith*, is to have such works as need to be pardoned, even when they are accepted of God, for Christs sake, unto everlasting salvation. When *Augustine* does tell us so often that faith justifies, *gratiam impetrando*, let us take *grace* in his and also in our acception, and both together will compleat the notion. Faith goes to God for his grace, or *help*, whereby we perform the condition, and so justifies us: Faith goes to God also for his grace or *favour*, to pardon and accept what is done for Christs sake, and so justifies us. As it does impetrate grace, or obtain his spirit for our duty; and then impetrates grace, or finds favour also for acceptance of it, take them both together, and we understand fully how we are justified by Faith. As our trusting to a good man, does naturally draw out, win, or procure his assistance which yet is free and not of debt; so does our trusting in God for acceptance, when it hath first been effectual upon us to the performing our part to that end, procure the same from him to our justification. Let us take heed of making faith a *single* act as it does *specificative*: and a *complex* act, as it does *reduplicative* justify the believer. These are two extreams I think, and to be thus composed. And so you have my poor thoughts at full upon this vexed question.

I come then to the third thing wherein the Father is out, and that is in his notion of justification it self, which is the making us just, by infusion. This the Papists have so improved, as in effect to exclude pardon from it. For while they place the work of justification in the abolishing of all sin in the *baptized* and *justified*, so that there remains no longer any thing that is *peccatum*, but *somes peccati* only, they do, I must say in effect, put us to dispute with them, whether there be any remission of sins at all, seeing the wicked are not pardoned, and the justified have their sins so done away by this infused grace, as to have none; and from hence does there spring their doctrine of *merit*, and *perfection*, which the controversie of *justification by works*, does carry along with it. Now I doubt not but the truth here (as it doth every where), is suffering between two thieves. That there is no *merit* or *perfection* I am convinced, and that our works do not *merit* because they are not *perfect*: but that

that we are justified by *works*, as we are by *faith*. St James his words must go as well as St Pauls; and both must stand good, because faith justifies only as productive of works. Justification indeed is by *works*, but not *meritorious works*: by works which make the reward to be of *grace*, but not by works which make the reward to be of *debt*, so the Apostles are before reconciled.

There are two questions then may adjust this great matter between *Us* and the *Papists*, or unto which the issue of our disputes on this point may be reduced. In the one they have the advantage of us, in the other we have the better of them. The lover of truth must be humbly hardned to follow its footsteps wheresoever he finds them, whither on the one side or the other.

The first question is, whether the righteousness we perform our selves, or that Christ performed for us, be the *matter* of our justification? and I say, the faith, repentance, new obedience, which the Christian through divine aid performs himself, is accepted with God for Christs sake unto pardon of sin, and eternal life. It is true, the obedience of Christ wrought for us, does justifie us *suo genere*, by meriting the pardoning, justifying Covenant, which is the donative instrument of pardon and life: But if the question be askt, whether we have performed that which this instrument requires, as *conditio tituli*, it must be our own faith and repentance here that is the *matter* of our righteousness. A man may be just in respect to the law of *innocency*, which no man but Christ ever was: or in respect to the law of *grace*, which all are, and must be, that are saved. Again, a man may be just in respect to the *preceptive* part of a law: or the *retributive* part. It is Christs righteousness and sacrifice alone that justifies us in regard of the one, but not so in regard of the other: yet is it that alone which is the meritorious cause both of the acceptation of what we do, and freedom from the Laws condemnation.

The second question is, whether Salvation then and justification is not according to our *merits*? And I answer, as the Scripture is clear and full from one end to the other for the *affirmative* in the former question: so is the Apostle Paul as full and cleer and positive as can be for the *negative* in the latter. What is it indeed he beats upon but this altogether? that there are no works in the earth (Christs excepted) that do merit: and that justification and Salvation therefore are of *grace*. *Not of works, but of grace*. What is that in the sense and meaning, but as much as if he should

D

have

have said it in exprefs terms, not of *merit*, but of *grace*; or, not of works that are meritorious, and would make the reward to be of debt: but of such works that though they be rewarded, it is of grace, and more than in justice according to the law, God needed to have done. For this is the meaning of the Apostle in excluding of merit. There is a paternal government according to the law of grace wherein the denial of a reward due to our works were to overthrow all Religion: A good child by his filial behaviour merits love and benefits: We dispute not unless *de nomine* only, against such a merit as this. But as to a merit in Gods *strict distributive* justice according to the law of works, or any other justice, which should make our works to be meritorious *ex condigno non solum ratione pacti & acceptationis, sed ratione operis*, as *Beilarmine* with some Papists does speak, *St Paul* is full in the denial. It is nothing else certainly but the misapprehension of the word *grace* in *St Austin*, received by the Church of Rome from him, that could have blinded them so in this point of *Justification*. I have shewn his mistake in this term, and in those of *works*, and *grace*, and have and do here give you the right sense of each according to the Apostle. The certain truth is this, God gave a law to man according to his creation, and if he had performed that, or any of us could perform that, then should he as Creator and Rector be engaged to reward the performance according to this law, so that the reward should be of right: but seeing man is fallen, and no Person on earth does or can perform that law, there are no works on earth that do properly merit, or no man on earth that can be justified, if he have only his desert by his works. This is undoubtedly the very entendment of the Apostle. That all *boasting* and *merit* may be excluded from the world, while it is proved that no mortal is justified or saved but by *grace*. And what need further conviction in this matter? we have the Papists own words, and general confessions, that they are all sinners, and that it is through Christs merits that they merit. If they are sinners, then have they not these works that are meritorious, but it must be of mercy that they are not condemned; and if it be through Christs merits that they merit, then is the reward not for the *work* sake, but for *his*. And what is it that Christ hath *merited*, that they should *merit*? It must come to this, that Christ by what he hath done for us, hath merited or procured this grace or favour from God, that he should accept of our imperfect performances, which

could not else be accepted, to Salvation. Of this grace he hath made and promulgated the *promise*. Upon the promise the reward becomes *due*. A reward upon promise, the condition being performed, becomes debt. And thus if the Papists say their good works merit, the use of the word is common with the Antients. Well then, let me recount this back to them, their good works merit, that is only, they make the reward due from God. They make it due from him, that is only because of his promise. *Debet sibi, non tibi*, says the Father. This promise is only of grace, or made freely out of favour procured by Christ. Our good works then must have such a merit attributed to them, as makes the reward due only of *grace* and for *Christs sake*: and not such as makes it due of *right* or *justice*, and for the *works sake*. And such a merit, what is it indeed but no merit, or but a word only? It is such a merit as our perfect works, which answer the law would have if we did them, to make the reward to be so of *debt* as *not* to be of *grace*, that we, and the Apostle dispute against in this doctrine of justification.

To return to *Augustines* error. Justification I very believe is to be taken in the Protestants notion, who do no less truly and judiciously, than industriously distinguish Sanctification and Justification: and, when they place the one in the work of the spirit renewing the whole man; and enabling us to dye unto sin, and live unto God, they place the other in an act of Gods grace whereby he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous for Christs sake. As for what they add usually in the definition that Christs righteousness is imputed to us, and made ours by faith as an instrument, I must confess they are notions, which as they never came into the head of *St. Augustine*, nor were received (I suppose) in the Church till within a Century or two of years since: so do I question whether a Century or two more may not wear them quite away again. That the righteousness of Christ performed in the whole course of his life and death was so pleasing, acceptable, and satisfactory to God, that the whole World upon that account, or for the merit of it, stands reconciled to him so far as that he hath vouchsafed a universal conditional pardon, or law of grace, to all mankind, according to the tenour of the Gospel, and consequently that every person who truly repents and believes, are made partakers thereof in regard of this benefit, or in the effect, is a truth which we embrace: but when this very phrase of the imputation

of Christs righteousness is not found in the Scripture, and the terms are used constantly in such a sense as if we were to be taken for perfectly righteous in Christs obedience, and to have satisfied the law in his sufferings all one as if our selves had performed the same, that is, as if it were ours, *in it self*, and not only in the *benefit*, or as to the end or intent Christ performs it for us, it is a conception of such another extrem to that of St *Augustines*, as requires also our equal rectification.

It is manifest through the Scripture, that good works, holy duties and performances of men and women, are accepted of God, and so accepted, that they are rewarded by him with eternal Salvation. *If thou wilt have life, keep the commandments. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, eternal life. I have fought the good fight, therefore is laid up for me a Crown of righteousness. Come ye blessed of my Father, for when I was hungry ye fed me.* If then the keeping the Commandements, a patient continuance in well doing, the fighting the good fight, and our works of charity be produced in judgment, as that for which we are declared righteous, absolved and pronounced blessed, it must be in some sounder than the ordinary sense, that our Divines bring in the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us for our justification; which if it be more than absolution from sin, and acceptance of us to eternal life, let it be weighed and judged.

In Ezekiel the Lord is speaking of the righteous man, and repenting sinner. *When the righteous turneth from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, shall he live? his righteousness shall not be mentioned, but in his sin which he hath sinned, he shall dye.* Again, *If the Wicked turn from his sins and does that which is right, all his transgressions which he hath committed shall not be mentioned; in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live.* It is apparent from hence, that there is a righteousness which is a mans own, a righteousness which he hath *done*, wherein the righteous man that continues in it, or the penitent sinner that turns to it, shall live. To live in a mans righteousness beyond doubt, is all one as to be justified by it. *He that doth them saith the law shall live in them*, that is shall be justified by them. If you make a question, there is another Text must convince you. *The just man shall live by his faith.* What is it to live by our faith? that you will not deny, is to be justified by it; for the Apostle alledges this Scripture to prove justification by Faith. Well! There is no man of reason now can imagine that

that the righteousness which is here spoken of, is Christs righteousness, and yet the righteousness which is here, is that, a man shall live in. It follows, that it is not therefore the righteousness of Christ from without imputed, but the righteousness which man himself does (through Christ indeed meriting, and his spirit assisting) whereby he must be justified and saved. It is by his faith that he shall live in one Prophet, and by his righteousness which he hath done, in another. Put them together, and they come to one, as they must do, and that is, by the righteousness of faith, to wit, by that righteousness of life, or holy working which faith produces in a godly mans conversation, and which God requires every where as the condition of the forgiveness of his sins, and the acceptance of him to life everlasting.

It is observed by *Arminius* that the Apostle does several times in one Chapter (I count not the number,) tell us that faith is imputed for righteousness. That *Abraham's was*, that ours *shall*, or *is*, again and again. But it is no where said that Christs righteousness is imputed to us for righteousness. Indeed the phrase could not be so used. We might say properly enough (supposing it true in the common construction) that Christ's righteousness were imputed: but not imputed for righteousness. For to be imputed for righteousness is to stand one instead of perfect righteousness, which cannot be said of Christs, seeing that it self was most perfect. A thing cannot be accounted instead of that which it is. This Argument now of *Arminius* is good, that seeing faith which is a mans own act is imputed for righteousness; therefore, not the righteousness, acts, or obedience of another. But when this acute Divine would introduce a notion hereupon, that the *verbo credere*, therefore must justify us, and not *works*, or not the *verbo operari*, it is both an ill and weak conceit, which is neither of use nor value. For as the Scripture speaks of faith being accounted for righteousness, so does it tell us that *Abrahams offering his Son*, and *Phineas* act were accounted to them for righteousness, and that *Rahabs* hiding the Spies did justify her. That is, it is faith as productive of works, or works as produced by faith, that receives the reward of perfect righteousness, which is, we are still to remember also for Christs sake, or through his merits; not imputed to us as proprietors, but prevailing with the Father for such terms for sinners as answers our redemption and grace of the Gospel.

I would fain know of any man who is most Orthodox in his complexion,

piexion, whether he does, or is able to think, that *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Job*, who were before the law, *Samuel*, the *Kings* and *Prophets*, who were under the law, or any man or woman whatsoever before the coming of Christ, did ever imagine that they were righteous, and to be accepted with God for the obedience which the *Messiah* should perform in their behalf when he came into the world, and that the believing this was an instrument of making it to be theirs, and so to be imputed to them which it could not be else: or whether they did not look on themselves to be righteous by doing righteously, and to obtain Gods favour by their upright walking with him, and no otherwise in the World? They judged not their own righteousness the meritorious cause of pardon to answer the Curse of the Law of Innocency, but they believed in Gods mercy, and so repented, obeyed, and were saved through the Redeemer. *And Enoch walked with God, and God took him.* Blessed is the man says *David* who walks in his ways, and to whom he imputeth no sin. In the acceptation then of a mans own upright walking, and in the pardon of his sins, did our justification and blessedness lye in *David*s time: and in the same no doubt does it lye still under the Gospel. I would yet fain know whether any of the Disciples, *James*, *John*, or *Paul* himself, whether *Clemens Roman*; or *Alexandrine*, *Iustin Martyr*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, or any of the Fathers, whether Councils, or School-men, whether *John Hus*, or *Wickliffe*, or any famous or holy Writer (without resting on some bare incoherent scraps of sentences) did ever understand, or receive the full notion of faiths instrumentality, and the imputation of a passive righteousness before *Luther*? And if not, whether it be possible it should be of any such moment as is made of it by most Protestants? It was an Article indeed that reigned in *Martins* heart, and I do therefore give it my obeysance: but it is no Article I take it, as the remission of sins is, in the Creed of the Apostles.

¶ If the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us (as if it were ours in it self) it must be the righteousness of his *active*, or *passive* obedience, or *both*. If his *active* obedience be imputed to us, then must we be look't upon in him as such who have committed no sin, nor omitted any duty, and then what need will there be of Christs death? how shall Christ dye for our sins if we be look't on in Christ as having none at all? If Christs *passive* obedience be imputed, then must we be look't on as such who in Christ have suffered and satisfied

satisfied the law, and born the full curse of it, and then how shall there be room for any pardon? The man who pays his full debt by himself or surety, can in no sense be forgiven by his Creditour. Indeed the Argument of the *Socinian* from pardon against Christs satisfaction is not valid: but it is good against the imputation of it to us as if we our selves had satisfied. Christ may have wrought with the Father (or made him that satisfaction as) to procure new terms, so that a man may be justified as a fulfilser of them, and yet need pardon for non-performance of the old. If Christs active and passive obedience both are imputed, then must God be made to deal with man according to the *Covenant of works* in the business of his justification, when nothing is more apparent in the Scripture than that by *grace* it is, that a man is justified, and by *grace* saved. If nothing less than such a righteousness as does both answer, and satisfy the law also, and that fully, will suffice for the sinners plea to free him from condemnation, he is not judged by the *law of grace*, but he is judged by the *law of works*, out of question. There were no need to bring this notion of Christs imputed righteousness into the Church, but that our Protestants mistake themselves, and forget that we are justified and saved by the *Covenant of Grace*, and not by the law of *Moses*, or *Covenant of our Creation*. Christ came into the World to procure and tender a new law; and in this regard is he said to be our Law-giver: not that he hath given any other *moral* rules of life to us (for we know his commandment only is *Love*) than what was contained in the Law before, wherein some do but bodily impose upon themselves and others: but that he hath given the same precepts with *indulgence*. If God then shall not deal with man in his justification here and at judgment according to that *indulgence*, or according to the law now in Christs hands, that is according to the *Covenant of Grace*, the main business of Christ's coming and redemption were lost. You shall hear a Protestant in his prayer appealing from the Tribunal of Gods Justice, to the throne of his grace, and yet in his Sermon be telling the people that it is nothing else but the perfect obedience and satisfaction of Christ imputed to them that saves them; which is to bring them back from the *throne of his grace*, to the *bar of his justice* to be judged. Such appeals have been received I suppose from the Fathers, as very significant of truth, and their meaning: but not agreeable to this notion,

In the last place, there is a righteousness revealed in the Gospel,
that

that God went by in his dealing with all the holy men and women who were before Christ, and which he goes by in his dealing with us now and all the World, whereby it is that we are justified in opposition to the *righteousness of works*, the which together with the *grace of the Gospel* in the true sense, and import thereof, is kept out of the *Protestant understanding* by this notion of the rigid imputation of Christs righteousness in it self, that being also but a late and forced notion, and not tending to holiness of life (tho' they have bin holy men that have received it), it is on the hearts I find of several Persons, and sorts of Persons disagreeing otherwise in their way (the providence of the Almighty who is the Author, being the Conductor of all truth to its proper use and end), to shew themselves against it, and to advance this tenet (if I may offer the determination) to the contrary. That the justification of a sinner is not by the imputation of Christs righteousness made his in it self by faith as an instrument: but by the *righteousness of faith*; to wit, by Christs righteousness, as the meritorious cause, and his faith and resolution first, and sincere obedience added after, as the condition of pardon and life through him: or by our sincere obedience proceeding from faith, which being in it self but imperfect as to the Law, is imputed for righteousness to the sinner for Christs merits sake, through the grace of the Gospel.

But now the *righteousness of God* without the law is manifested, having witness of the Law and the Prophets. *Si ergo nunc manifestata est, etiam tunc erat sed occulta.* If it be now manifested, it must have bin before lying hid. Aug. de peccato originali cont. Pel & Cel. c. 25. *Et tunc ergo ista gratia mediatoris erat in populo Dei, sed tanquam in vellere pluvia.* And then was there this grace of the Mediator among Gods people as the rain in the fleece, that is, though unseen or not understood. *Ib.* I observe here that the *righteousness of God*, and the *grace of the Mediator*, is rightly made by this Father to be one. We are said to be justified by *grace*, and not by *works*: so by the *righteousness which is of God*, and not of *works*. What then is that righteousness of God which is the grace of Christ, and by which we are justified? By this grace and righteousness, it is certain, that *Austine* understands inherent grace, which is a quality infused by the Spirit in our hearts, enabling us to good works, and that this way do the Papists go after him, according to what also is said before. *Istam quippe gratiam qua justificamur, id est, qua Charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris — De gra-*

tia Christi, c. 30. that is, the grace whereby we are justified, is no other but the love of God shed abroad in our hearts, or the grace of Charity whereby faith is made perfect, and so justifies as they and he agree. Now this grace is opposed to works, and called the righteousness which is of God, and not of works according to them (which hath been said before likewise) because it is that which is given or infused of God, and not wrought by our own strength, or procured by our deserts. *Iustitia ex lege dicitur qua fit propter legis mandatum, iustitia ex Deo dicitur qua datur per gratia beneficium.* lb. c. 12. That is said to be the righteousness of the law or of works, which is done through the strength of our selves only upon the command: that is the righteousness of God which we are helped to do by the benefit of grace. Again, *Non dicitur iustitia nostra sed Dei, quia sic fit nostrum ut nobis ex Deo.* It is not said our righteousness, but the righteousness of God because it is ours so as to be first given of God. In the same Chapter and Book. The truth is, the Father being possessed with his own dispute, as it is incidental to the mind to fashion all things according to the impressions it hath received, does frame such a meaning still in the words of the Apostle, as if Paul as well as he, were purposely writing against Pelagius. There are three things in the soul said that Noted Person, *Posse, Velle, & Esse, Possibilitas, Voluntas & Actio*, as *Aquinas* expresses it, the Power, the Will, and the Deed. The grace of God he accounted was conversant only about the Power, and not the Will, or the Action. Not that he placed all grace only in the giving the power, for that must confound Grace and Nature indeed quite, seeing all have the power: but allowing grace to lye in divine help, the power alone he held was aided by God, and the will left to its self. This aid now in explaining himself he confined to Doctrine. God he said does reveal what he would have done in his law, and in the gospel, and gives us besides Christs example, and then the will of it self (the power alone thus helped) embraces that which is good. St *Augustine* therefore sets himself to Prove, that God does not assist us only by his word, but by operating on the will, and giving us hearts also to do it. And for as much as we do nothing of our selves but by his help, or by the operation of his spirit, it is by grace, says he, that we are justified, and not by works. *Quomodo est gratia si non gratis datur? quomodo est gratia si ex debito redditur?* How is it grace if it be not of free gift? How is it grace if it be rendered as debt? De gra. Chr. c. 23.

Again, *Non enim Dei gratia erit ullo modo nisi gratuita fuerit omni modo.* It cannot be the grace of God at all, if it be not free altogether, De pec. or. c. 24. One would think this Father in such speeches as these had imbibed the Protestant notion of grace; but we are mistaken, for his thoughts still ran upon the grace of God infused in our hearts, that is the inherent work of the spirit which he pleads to be *gratuitous*, because it is not at first given for our merits. The works which we do of our selves without grace he accounts merits nothing, but are splendid sins: the works which we do from grace or by the spirit do justify according to him, and merit eternal salvation. *Quod si vocatus vocantem secutus fuerit, quod est in libero arbitrio, merebitur & spiritum sanctum per quem bona possit operari: in quo permanens quod nihilominus est in libero arbitrio, merebitur vitam eternam qua nulla possit labi corrumpi.* But if he that is called shall follow his call, which is in our free will, he shall merit the holy Ghost by whose help good works may be performed: wherein if he persevere, which is no less in his power, he shall merit eternal life; which is perfect and never fadeth away. In lib. expos. ad Romanos. The Protestant meeting with this doctrine in the Papist are no ways satisfied with such an interpretation. By the *Righteousness of God* therefore, as by the *grace of God*, opposed to *works*, they will by all means conceive of a righteousness without us, that is the righteousness of Christ, which is not ours by performance, but by faith. But neither the Protestants after *Luther*, nor the Papists after *Austine* have hit the mind of the Apostle. The *righteousness of God* and *grace* opposed to *works* is really nothing else but the righteousness of the Covenant of Grace accepted by God for Christs sake, instead of the righteousness of the Covenant of Works. Herein are two things comprized, the meritorious righteousness of Christ procuring the pardoning Covenant of Grace, & our performing the Condition. Only we are to know this *righteousness* may be understood therefore either with respect to God as it is all one I say with his *grace*: or with respect to Us, as it is all one with that upon which this grace is vouchsafed. *Charitas Dei dicta est diffundi in cordibus nostris, non quia nos ipse diligit, sed quia nos facit dilectores suos: sicut iustitia Dei, qua iustus ejus munere efficitur.* As it is called the love of God whereby we are made to love him, so the righteousness of God whereby we are made righteous through his gift. Aug. de spir. & lit. c. 32. It is true that this righteousness is wrought in us by the spirit, and flows not from our selves; it is true also that as we perform it by his aid, it is our

own work: yet is not the one the reason why it is called the *righteousness of God*, nor the other any hinderance why it should not be so called: for the reason lyes altogether in the opposition of it meerly to that of *works*. Let a man do all that he can, whether by his own strength, or by Gods aid, he can never come up to the law of works, or to a conformity to the terms of the Covenant of *nature* or Law of *Moses*, as it was a representation of that Covenant, so that by the deeds thereof he cannot be justified: and for as much as it pleased God therefore to vouchsafe us a new law, the law of faith, or grace, or the new Covenant having lower terms, that in the performance hereof, or in a conformity only hereunto, the man who is a sinner in respect of the law, may be righteous, and so God just in justifying him, this grace and condescension of God being meerly from his own good will, is called thus the *righteousness which is of him*, in opposition to the other which of *nature*: and so were ours, or *mans righteousness* properly, if he could attain unto the same. But when he cannot attain unto that which is so by *nature*, whatsoever he attains, if it be less, must be a righteousness only through *grace*, which notwithstanding our shortness, God mercifully condescends to accept, instead of that which is perfect, through the merits of our Saviour, and in regard of that acceptation (*N. B.*) or this good will, it is called *his*, or the righteousness *which is of him* (of his own free contriving, appointing, tender and allowance), when in regard of performance it is ours, though we do it by his help. Lo here the true key that opens the mind of the Apostle, and consequently the door to that treasure which depends upon it.

That which is said I know by some Protestants most to the quick is this, that *pardon* indeed is an act of meer *grace*, but *justification* is an act of *justice* according to law, and therefore must Christs righteousness which alone does answer the law be brought in to justify the believer. But this is a mistake, for whether justification lyes in pardon or no, according to that of the Apostle, [*Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven*] it is expressly declared by the Apostle to be by *grace*, *Being justified freely by his grace*. True indeed, it is an act of *righteousness*, even a judicial or forensic act, that is according to law, but what law? not the law of *Works*, but according to the law of *Faith*. It is an act I say of that *righteousness* of God, and no other which the Apostle sets forth in opposition to the law and works, and makes all

one with his *grace*. To reckon it then an act of justice according to the Law, intending thereby the law of works, is to correct the Apostle, and to tell him we know better how we are justified by Christ than he. It is the understanding of this righteousness whereof we are now speaking will set us all right. It is Christs obedience and sufferings alone no doubt which could make any compensation to God for our sins, that he might without diminution to his honour as Law-giver, or Governour, recede from his first law, but when Christ hath by his satisfaction procured this, that God should now deal with us by a new law, the remedying law, or upon other terms, the thing is manifest in it self, that the righteousness then which is pleaded and accepted for this satisfaction sake of Christ, must be this righteousness of the new law, or the righteousness of *faith* and not of *works*; which both denominates the performer righteous, and God just in justifying him according to it. *For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth*. That is, as I construe it, Christ by his satisfaction hath procured that we should not be judged by the law of works, and consequently that righteousness, or justification, be attained if we do but perform the terms of the Gospel. *To declare I say at this time his righteousness that he might be just and a justifier of him that believes in Jesus. Who is made unto us of God*, (that is a phrase I take it signifying no more than through whom (one way or other *sensu causali* or *eius merito*) God would have us obtain all spiritual blessings) *wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption*.

After this there are no texts I count (such as the last purposely mentioned) which are pressed by our Divines for their service before, that are able to carry such a burthen. *He hath made him sin for us* (sin at the expiatory sacrifice under the law is called sin) *who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*. That is, he who was the immaculate Lamb was made a sacrifice for our sins, that we may become righteous with the righteousness of God, which he accepts through him. Christ as a Sacrifice redeems us from the law of sin, and purchases for us a law of grace: according to that law we have a righteousness which is accepted unto life through Christ. I pray note it therefore, it is not said that his righteousness might be made ours, nor that we might be made his righteousness: but that we might be made the *righteousness of God*. And what is the righteousness of God I have shewn you just now, and what *in him* likewise is declared here

together with it. *Ut simus iustitia Dei in ipso. Hæc est illa iustitia Dei, non quæ ipse iustus est, sed quæ nos ab eo facti.* That we should become the righteousness of God in him. This is that righteousness of God, not whereby he is righteous, but whereby we are made so of him. *Augustine* again, in the last cited place. It is true, that then there is a righteousness of faith, and righteousness of God (of faith as the root of the whole condition) which are one, and by which in opposition to the righteousness of works we are justified; but that this righteousness of God and of Faith, is only the obedience of Christs life and death which he performed for us, is assumed as much without reason, as any consent of that Father. To this purpose, I take it, is God styled in the Old Testament, *The Lord our righteousness*, that is, in his condescension to accept us for Christs sake as righteous by a law of grace, when in strict justice he might condemn us for sinners. It is not appropriated to the second Person, but to be understood of that Gospel goodness of God whereby he imputeth righteousness to us, when we have none according to the law of our creation, that is imputing the righteousness of faith to us without the works of that Covenant. *All our merits O Lord (says the Father) are thy mercy.* This is the true and excellent import of that expression, signifying moreover that God hath found out the means to demonstrate his justice no less fully (and his goodness more fully) to the World in saving us by this new law, through his Sons mediation, than if we had kept our first innocency; or underwent his eternal judgment for our transgressions.

Another text which is a fellow with this, I take it in sense and words, is that to the *Romans*. *As by one mans disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.* For the interpretation of this Text, there are two things only I can say firmly. One is that the opinion that God does look on a believer, or that a believer may look on himself, to have fully obeyed the Law in Christs obedience, so as it is by imputation his in its self, is so gross an apprehension, that it is beyond my belief. This is the perfect *Antinomian* faith, which excludes repentance quite out of his life. The other is, that in what sense soever he is righteous through Christs obedience it can be no otherwise, than that as he is a sinner through Adams sin, and that sin, the eating the forbidden fruit, cannot be his in it self, but in its fruit, or effects only. I comment therefore these words thus.

As through *Adams* sin we came into the state of the fall, and so do all sin, or are sinners against the law, which none fulfil: so by Christs obedience to his Father whereby he procured the grace of a new law for us we are brought to such a state, as that many become righteous, and are justified by the performance. That all man-kind is involved in *Adams* first sin, our Divines are agreed against *Pelagius*. The most understand this to come through the *Covenant* or *Will* of God: there are some apt to conceive only that *Adam* being the natural root of mankind, human nature it self sinned in him, and so when we come to exist, his guilt is derived upon our persons as *virtually* and *seminally* in him, no otherwise then *Levi* is said to have paid tythes to *Melchisedech* in the loyns of *Abraham*. I should incline to this explanation, but that I see not then why all the sins of *Adam* besides, and of all our Progenitors, should not be *ours* also upon the same account, as much as that first transgression. Distinguish we therefore between the *precept*, thou shalt not eat of the Tree, under this Covenant: and the *threatning* upon breach of it. The Precept plainly belong'd to our first Parents only, and as none of us broke that precept which we had not, so can we not be reputed to have that sin (in it self) which we never committed: nevertheless the penalty being by the Will or Covenant of God to extend to their progeny (which falls out ordinarily in mans laws also), that sin of *Adams* which *in it self* could be *his* only, in the *effects* threatned upon the commission does become *ours* also. God does so impute that act to us, that we are all, as well as he, deprived of original righteousness, corrupted in our nature, and sure to dye: In like manner (I take it) are we to conceive of the imputation both of our sins to Christ, and of his righteousness to us. Our sins are not laid upon him to make a sinner; but to be a propitiation for our sins. He was not made sin or accounted a sinner, *quoad reatum culpæ*, as if he were guilty of our facts, but he was dealt with as a sinner, *quoad reatum pænæ*, in regard to the obligation unto satisfaction, which as a *Sponsor* he was to make in our behalf. The righteousness of Christ likewise which he performed as *Sponsor* or *Mediator*, cannot be ours either really or representatively *in it self*, because this righteousness as *Mediator* is proper to his Person, and is not the very same required of any, or all of us in the law it self? but his righteousness as *Mediator*, even his whole submission to the law of his Mediatorship in life and death, is ours *respectively* as to what it procured, or to what he intended

tended it should procure, in as much as we are partakers of the benefits that derive from it. Our sins were *Christ's* in the causation of his sufferings : *Christ's righteousness* is ours in the effects of pardon and life eternal.

A third text, and which carries our Divines I think more than any, is that to the *Philippians*. *I count all things but loss that I may win Christ, and be found in him not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.* In these words, our Protestants observe that the righteousness of God, and of faith, is opposed to that righteousness which is our own, and therefore it must be a righteousness without Us, received by faith. But they are mistaken; for, besides that the righteousness of faith and of God, is not the same with the righteousness of Christ, as hath been before observed, they are to know that this righteousness which Paul calls his own in this Text, is the righteousness of the Jew; that is, the Jews own, or his own as a Jew & a Pharisee; not our own, or his own as a Christian. This appears from the Verses before. *If any thinketh that he hath whereof he may trust in the flesh, I more, circumcised the eighth day, an Hebrew of the Hebrews as touching the Law of Pharisees, as touching righteousness which is of the law blameless.* This appears farther from another text, which together with this alone is all that hath any such Antithesis in the Terms *ἡ δικαιοσύνη*, from whence they fetch this conjecture. *I hear them record that they have a Zeal for God, but not according to knowledge.* For they being ignorant of Gods righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God. It is certain now from these places both, that there is a righteousness which was Pauls own and the Jews own which he excludes from justification, and opposes to the righteousness of faith and of God: but this I say is not the Christian righteousness. The Christians faith & new obedience are his own acts out of doubt by Gods help, & his righteousness according to the Gospel: & you shall never read St Paul saying, *I desire to be found in Christ not having my own repentance, my own faith, love, and new obedience, which are conditions of being found in him that we may be justified.* Pauls own righteousness as a Jew, or as a Pharisee I say is one thing, and Pauls faith and obedience which is his righteousness as a Christian is another. And this distinction our Saviour himself hath first offered: *Except your righteousness, exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees.*—The
righte-

righteousness of works is twofold. The righteousness of *Mankind*, according to the Covenant of *Nature*: and the righteousness of the *Jews*, while they reckoned to be justified by the external observation only of the rites of *Moses*. The one of these *exceeds* the righteousness of faith, and we are not justified by it, because no man can attain to it: the other *falls short* of the righteousness of faith, or of a true Christian, according to these words of our Lord, and for that reason, as for several others, the establishment of it was dangerous to their Salvation.

A last text they have, *what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.* It is urged here by a Perfectist, that if the Protestant doctrine were true, it should be said that the righteousness of the law should be fulfilled in Christ, and not in us. But these words I apprehend may be a phrase of the Apostles, as the words *attaining unto righteousness* elsewhere; and so it will be all one as if he had said, *that we might be justified, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.* Nevertheless, there is this here must be known and noted, that when a Christian obeys God according to the Gospel, that obedience of his proceeding from faith, though imperfect, is accepted of God instead of the laws perfect righteousness, or stands him in the stead for Christs sake as if the whole law were fulfilled, which is the ground of such expressions. From whence in the way we may have light for the understanding the Apostle, when he tells us *the law is established by faith*, or uses the like words. The law is established only by the fulfilling of it; and faith as it works by love fulfils the law. But how? why in the sense (*N. B.*) as is now told you. Faith produces obedience which is imperfect, yet answering the terms of the Gospel, it is, through that grace and condescension from God which Christ hath purchased for us in the work of our redemption, imputed to us for righteousness, that is, accepted and rewarded so, as it is made to stand us in the same stead as the full performance of the law would have done, which is to justify us, and bring us life eternal.

When God made man he gave him a law suitable to his Creation. That law being founded in the image of God, wherein he was created, is most holy, equal, and unchangeable. God as Rector must deal with the World according to this law, so that man tran-

transgressing, he is engaged to proceed against him by it, unless there be some means found out that he may be no loser in his justice if he do not. There is nothing can be offered to God but his justice and holiness must be losers, if it be of consideration less valuable than that which the law it self required, which is the obedience of all mankind, or their everlasting suffering for its transgression. No Man or Creature but Christ alone could offer any such satisfaction as this for us. And this he offered in the obedience or righteousness of his whole life and death, as the price, sacrifice, ransom, propitiation for our sins: which through the dignity of the Person that offered it, being the Son of God as well as man, was of value which is infinite. That which exceeds a thing or is more in value than it, cannot be the very thing it self which in value it exceeds. The righteousness then of Christ is really imputed to man, tendered in his behalf; and made ours in regard of this effect (or in the end to which it was intended I will say, when it cannot be ours in it self), to wit, that God being satisfied or made no loser in his justice hereby does deal with us otherwise than by that law unto which at first we were created. If he deals not with us then according to that, it must be by some other, which hereby also is purchased; and that is according to his *grace* or *righteousness* revealed in the Gospel. This *grace* of righteousness lies in his acceptance of faith and repentance instead of perfect obedience for this righteousness sake of Christ thus imputed, and no otherwise than thus. When our Divines now say that there are no works of ours can stand before God in his district judgment that they should be *causa propter quam, the cause for which*, (that is for the merit sake, or worthiness whereof) he should justify any person, they say well; and their meaning is, that our works coming not up to the *original law*, God cannot for the performance of them, absolve us as no sinners? but yet seeing they are such as answer the terms of the Gospel, he does for Christ's sake, or his merits sake, both pardon their imperfection, and impute them to us for righteousness, in the accepting them to life, or rewarding them with everlasting Salvation. In short, Christs righteousness is imputed to us, but not for righteousness. It is for the *righteousness sake*, but not formally though efficiently by the *righteousness* of another we are justified. It is not Christ, but our selves, that perform the new Covenant, and by the *new Covenant* is it, or by *grace*, that we are righteous in Gods sight. It is not consequently

Christs sufferings or obedience, only, but our Faith, Obedience, sincerity also, that is rewarded with Salvation : yet is it not for the merit of this obedience of ours, but for his merits, or the merits of his righteousness. Behold ! this is the critical hidge upon which the whole controversie does turn. We will stand for the imputation of Christs righteousness (*N. B.*) so far as ever we can with holding justification by the Covenant of grace ; but when some Protestants have stood for it so, as renders our justification to be by the *Law*, or the Covenant of works, and not by *grace*, they have departed from the Apostle. And thus the dispute in the upshot will I think end in this, that Christs righteousness is the *meritorious*, indeed the *only meritorious*, or meritoriously *procuring efficient*, but must not be made the *formal* cause of mans justification.

And yet do I see there is need still of some more words, seeing here the heart of all lyes. A righteousness we must have if we be justified, and what is that righteousness ? There is a *Legal* righteousness : and *Evangelical*. Christs righteousness our Divines account our Legal righteousness which must answer the law for us : & our faith and repentance must be produced to answer the Gospel. The latter of these I take to be plain ; the former must be warily understood. There is the *Precept*, and the *Retribution* of the law. We must take heed that we conceive not Christ to be our legal righteousness in regard to the *Preceptive* part of the law (in the more frequent sense), as if we were reputed by God to have fulfilled the same, or satisfied it in him as representing our Persons, which is the error before confuted, and especially by the reason last mentioned, because this makes our justification to be by the law of *works*, (and not of *grace*) which subverts the Gospel ; but there is a righteousness in regard to the *Retributive* part of the law of works, consisting in our discharge from its curse and penalty, which is a *righteousness of pardon*, and if any will call this our *Legal* righteousness (which is yet conferred by the *Gospel*,) and account we have it in Christ, understanding nothing else by it, but that his righteousness is the meritorious cause of it, I know not any will oppose him, for this is that wherein we all center. It is true, that *pardon* and *righteousness* without explication is a contradiction, and therefore when we allow of a *righteousness of pardon*, there is a *strict* and a *large* sense to be acknowledged of terms used in Scripture. Blessed is the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works. The imputation of righteousness to a person is to account him
righteous,

righteous, and for a man to be accounted righteous *without works*, that is without righteousness, is (or may be supposed to be) explained in the next verse, *viz.* to be *pardoned*. By *works*, he understands works of the *Law* out of doubt, for without faith and repentance (or *Gospel works*) God imputes righteousness to none. Now how a man may be righteous according to the *law of grace*, and yet need pardon in reference to the *law of works*, the matter is plain; but to make a man *righteous* (through this pardon) in regard to the *Retribution*, and *guilty* in regard to the *Precept* of the same law, is a more perplex conception. To be acquitted from the condemnation of a law by being pronounced innocent, or to be adjudged to the reward by being declared to have fulfilled it, is in the strict sense to be justified; To be acquitted from the condemnation and be pronounced guilty, is to be *delivered* from the law, and not to be *justified*, but in a large sense of justification. Justification *from* a law, and not *by* it, is a Catechrestical speech, and I do question whether we should not (using a strict speaking) place the discharge of the sinner from condemnation, upon the score of Christ's *redemption*, rather than on the work of our *justification*. That God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself not imputing their trespasses, does import an universal conditional remission bestowed upon all, so far as a delivery of the whole World over from the *law of works* to be judged by the *law of grace*; and when we are at that bar, there is no inquest like to be made about Christ's work, whether he hath done his part, but whether we have done ours, that is performed our condition; and if we be found to have been upright to God in the main bent of our hearts and lives, notwithstanding our manifold failings, he accepts of us for Christ's sake, and declares us righteous according to this law; and so adjudges us to the reward or promise which is to have Christ and his benefits, whereof one is the application of his redemption, and therein our discharge from the Law's condemnation. And thus methinks the Apostle speaks with more accurateness, where justification and redemption are *de industria* distinguished, and the one made the means or foundation to the other. *Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus*. Redemption is the delivery of the World in general from the law, and so from its penalty on terms appointed by the Redeemer; Justification is the pronouncing of particular persons accepted upon those terms, and so to have a right to the purchased possession. In fine, there is but our own sincerity, and a right

to impunity and life, is all the righteousness (if a *right* be *righteousness*) that goes as ours in its self (and Christs only in regard to that effect) to a mans justification.

The import of all is, we are not to conceive a sinner to be brought before *two* bars that he should have need of a righteousness of perfect obedience in Christ to plead against the law, for Christ hath redeemed us from coming before this bar, by the ransome of his blood paid for all the World: but being to stand only at *one* bar, it is but one righteousness is sought as the condition upon which the sentence must pass, and as for that *Righteousness* we have through Christ besides, which is in regard only to the *retribution*, not the *work* of the law (if *Pardon* (I say) may be so called) it comes to us by way of sentence, or as a part of the reward given upon the condition performed. Only the redemption of Christ, I count is to be first supposed, with the whole righteousness of his Mediatorship, as the foundation, through the merits whereof, this new covenant is purchased, and so the reward given, for his sake, upon that condition. And if it be for Christs sake, for his merits, righteousness, mediation, redemption sake, we see also how this righteousness of his, even his Mediatory righteousness which cannot be ours possibly *in it self*, is yet imputed to us and made ours in the *effects*, or in the end to which it was performed, for salvation to Believers.

I will conclude all with the agreement of the two Apostles, which hath been already, but lightly, before touched.

When *Paul* then contends, that a man is not justified by the works of the law. By the works of the law, he means works as would justify him according to law if he had them, and says no man is justified hereby, because no man hath them, as he proves at large in the first and second Chapters to the *Romans*, as the very business and scope of both, to any that will consider of the matter, and so pleads a necessity of their *believing that they may be justified*. But when *St James* says a man is justified by works, he means not works that answer the law, or such as of themselves would justify the doer, which no man hath, neither *Abraham* himself, much less *Rahab* whom he also mentions, but such works as suppose grace to their acceptance through faith in the Redeemer, for the reconciling the Person, and covering his imperfections. And thus the two holy Penmen disagree not: but while the one saith, *I conclude a man is justified by faith without the works of the law*, and the other,

other. You see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only, the sense of both is, that though a man hath not the works of the law (the works the law *qua fœdus* requires of him) which would justify the doer if he did them (as for certain he does not, it being impossible for any to have these, so that if he be justified at all, he must be justified *without* them): yet is he justified by faith, provided that faith be accompanied with (or is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of) good works of another size; to wit, that will not make the reward to be of *debt*, but of *grace*, or that are unperfect and not able to justify him by law, yet are required in sincerity of life, together with his faith in the Redeemer (supposing him revealed, or else in the mercifulness of Gods nature) unto final justification, and salvation.

And now Reader, if thou art offended at this paper, I cannot help thy prejudice, but I desire thee to hear reason. If thou art sensible of that deadly advantage which is given to the Papists, by our ill treating this point, by the doctrine I mean more particularly, of Christs righteousness *imputed* in the unsound sense, especially when those that expound it worse, do ordinary lay most stress upon it: If thou art sensible yet nearer home, what a stumbling block hereby hath been laid in the way of a late numerous Sect among us (whom to name, methinks is some rudeness to them), that really having our Ministers here by the lock (that is the place where their only strength they have against us does lye), do reject the whole Tribe, as False Teachers that harbour men in their sins, and make Christ serve only to be a cover for them, as they bitterly traduce us, with great indignation, and in very earnest on this account (which I must confess hath affected me so much in reading their books, as to set me to write, and gives me yet a good conscience in what I do, though thou perhaps art angry with me for it) if lastly thou art sensible of the evil and danger of *Libertinism* or *Antinomianism*, which hath been lately so rise, though now allayed in this Land, what roots yet it hath alive in this notion misunderstood, thou wilt be advised with me, and others perhaps that see more than I, that it is time, that it is fit, this Sluce be stopt. The *Presbyterians* are my Friends, and the *Independants* my Friends, and Others my Friends, but Truth is greatest, and must overcome.

Deo Gloria mihi condonatio.

J. H.

Reader!

The Paper Printed next this of Justification was The middle way of Election and Redemption, where there is nothing said of this Point; but in the next Papers of the Covenant, Law, and Gospel, and of Perfection, there being more offered about the same, it is necessary (that you may have the Authors full thoughts) to be supplied.

Out of the Paper of the Covenants.

IT is one reason of my sending out these sheets thus in single Papers, that I may have the opportunity my self of Reflexion. If any thing be wanting I may supply it; where I am in the dark I may explain it, or call for Light; If I erre, I may correct it, and put my self at ease still when I need, as to the whole. It is verily a foolish thing I count for any man to think that he can speak or write so, as what he hath once spoken or written cannot be mended. When we change our thoughts every day and week in our private Studies, what a vain resolution is it, that because we have Preached or Printed thus, the shutters must be drawn up presently, and no more Light be let to come in upon us. For my part I declare, I will never Preach or Print upon such terms, but upon these: That I may be mistaken; That I may acknowledg it, if I be convinced. That I may therefore be controuled, and have leave to be indifferent to my own opinion, as to anothers.

In my Paper of Justification, I count there are two parts. The one is, a Reconciliation of *James* and *Paul*, and so of *faith* and *works* in that point; wherein I must confess I am the more confirmed, by seeing the same Notions as I have had many Years in my mind growing up since I wrote in the Books of such Authors, as the *Theses* of *Le Blanc*, *Mr. Truman*, *Sir Charles Wolesty*, to name no more. The other is concerning the *imputation* of *Christs righteousness*, which does require more words from me
before

before I come to another Subject, for my own satisfaction.

That Christs righteousness does justify us *from the Law*, and so from Sin, and from Condemnation, I do hold no less than others: but that Christs righteousness does justify us *by the Law*, is I take it an over-grown conception. It is certain, that no works of man be we never so holy, are able to stand before God in his district judgment; that is, if he should deal with us according to the exact justice of the Law without shewing us any mercy, which will be acknowledged by *Protestants* and *Papists*, who are ready to pray both with *David*, *Enter not into judgment with thy servants O Lord, for in thy sight shall no flesh living be justified.* If any *Papist* then shall think that mans righteousness is made so perfect by Christs merits: or, any *Protestant*, that Christs righteousness it self is so made ours, as that we are justified by the Law, upon that account, they are both mistaken. This is the only true extremity on both sides: for it is not by the Law, but by Faith; by the *Evangelical* covenant, or by *Grace* that we are justified. *We are not under the Law*, says the Apostle, *but under Grace.* It is enough for a poor sinner to have a righteousness imputed to him *without works*, and that he is pardoned; but to have a righteousness imputed to him *with works*, is more than we can find to be allowed him. Christs righteousness is such, and to have that made ours *in its self*, or so, as that in Gods reckoning we must be as righteous as he, I must needs say, it is not harder perhaps to believe that the bread is turned into Christs Body (where we have a text for it) in the Sacrament: than to believe such a conceit (for which we have no Scripture at all) in the matter of justification. What then? Do I deny imputation? No, but I explain it. It is by the righteousness of Christ, *not inherent in us*, our Divines will say Ordinarily, *but imputed to us*, that we are justified. And what if I thus interpret this for them; that is, not *as if we had done in his Person what Christ did*, but by his righteousness made ours in the effects only? So the Masterfully Learned Bishop *Forbes* expressly, *Hoc est, Quod effectum & fructum* (See *Considerationes modestæ. De justificatione*, l. 2. c. 2.) This is the Mediocran Determination, and not out of Mr *Baxter*.

Indeed a man can hardly consider the Doctrine of St *James* never so little with that of *Paul* which is one part of my Paper, but it will lead him to the other, which is to see that what our Protestants say ordinarily on this matter, does need a favourable

able exposition. It is a jejune thing, I count, to bring the great dispute that *Paul* hath with the *Jews* about justification to this result only, whether we are justified by *Faith*, or the proper *Work* or *Fruits* of it? It is but a little more satisfactory to bring it only to this, whether it be by the observation of *Moses Law*? For though this was the occasion of the dispute, and the *Apostle* therefore does shew them how it was by the *Promise*, and so by *Faith* that *Abraham* and the *Jews* themselves had life, and not by the *Law*, which was but a *Schoolmaster* to lead them thereunto, or unto *Christ*: yet it is manifest, that he advances the point higher, while he tells them that by *Works* neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* could be justified, so that by *works* he must mean the observation of that *Law of works* which was common to both, and not *Moses Law* only: and the resolution of the dispute in both *Apostles* comes to this (as I have said) that it is by the performance of the Covenant of *Grace*, and not of the covenant of *works*, or *Law of Moses*, that a man is to look for life everlasting. I must add, Nor are they to be heard in a third place, who say, that the dispute between *Paul* and the *Jews* is neither of these, but whether we are justified by our *Own* righteousness, or by the Righteousness of *Christ*, and so resolve that it is not by any *works*, which we do, even *faith* it self as a *work*, but by the *works* *Christ* hath done for us, that is, by the obedience of his life and death only. For though this be taught ordinarily by our *Protestants*, and is co-incident with the first result, there is one thing I must say these *Divines* have not considered which I have offered them in my *Paper*, that must bring them to another understanding. It is this, that the *Apostle* does indeed stand much upon the *Righteousness of God* in opposition to *works*, in the business of justification, but never opposes our *works* to the *Righteousness of Christ*: the Righteousness of *Christ* in their sense being truly a very contrary thing to the *Righteousness of God* in the sense of the *Apostle*. The righteousness of *God* according to the *Apostle*, if I may then describe it but as well as I can, and as the thing is, and a little more fully than I have in my former paper, is, on *Gods part*, his taking our human frailty or fawn nature into that meet consideration, as not to deal with us in his *distrikt judgment* which we cannot bear, but according to his *Covenant of Mercy*: the righteousness, sacrifice, attonement or satisfaction of *Christ* being supposed as the foundation upon which his Justice does stand good, notwithstanding this condescension: And consequently on

Mans

Mans part, this righteousness is our imperfect duty performed in sincerity according to this new Law, and so for Christs sake accepted to Salvation. In this sense am I apt to understand that everlasting Righteousness which is brought in, by the Messiah, or by his covenant, in Daniel: and in this sense do I construe that Title, *The Lord our Righteousness*.

There is the *uncreated, absolute* righteousness of God, which is the Divine essence it self, for as God is *Truth* in the abstract, so is he *Righteousness*: or the *created, relative* righteousness of God, that is his righteousness set forth in relation to us, which consists in his dealing with us as his Creatures according to our conditions. This *relative* righteousness then is double. The *Righteousness* or *Justice* of God according to the Covenant of works: and the righteousness or equity of God according to the Covenant of grace. The one I count to be that our Divines call his *Strict*: the other his *Paternal Justice*. When God made man at first and gave him the Law of his Creation, he was to deal with him according to this perfect Law, and it was but equal according to his perfect state, and this being the original righteousness (as I may say) of God in relation to us, there are none of us but do find some sense of it in our hearts, that makes us not so much only to *fear*, as to be *afraid* of him under that apprehension. But there is another *righteousness* than this, which was ever a foot in the world since the promise of the *womans seed*, or else there were no man could have bin saved, though it be said to be now *manifested* (as brought in, in Daniels phrase) because the reason upon which it is founded, that is mans reconciliation to God by Christ, is revealed by the Gospel, and this is the *righteousness of God opposed to works* (or to his *strict Justice* which he was bound to exercise according to the *Covenant of works*) that is so magnified by the Apostle. And here now is a distinction to be used which I have intimated, and want Terms to express. For this righteousness of God must be considered *with regard to himself* (let me say *Subjective*) which is his dealing with us according to the *Covenant of Faith* for Christs sake, when he might deal with us according to the *Covenant of Nature* if he would: and *with regard to us* (let me say *Terminative*), or to the condition upon which he does so mercifully deal with us. As the *Love of God* is taken in Scripture both for his *Love towards us*, and our *Love of him*: So is the *Righteousness of God* taken for both these, his dealing with us according to this covenant, and the condition on our part which

he accepts. And hence is it, that when it is called the *Righteousness of God* in one place, it is called the *Righteousness of Faith* in another; and in a third, the *Righteousness which is of God by Faith*. Now when it is our faith, our repentance, our new obedience which is the *Righteousness of God* it self (taken *Terminative*) whereby we are justified in opposition to the *works of the Law*, which no man can perform to be justified by them, and our *Divines by works*, will understand all good works, even this faith it self as a work (as was said), and our Evangelical obedience, inasmuch as when there is no righteousness but what is *without us* can be opposed to these, it makes them by the *Righteousness of God* to understand the *Righteousness of Christ* who is God, and by faith, the righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, which are in good earnest conceptions so strained: it appears (if I may use those words in humility) how being ignorant of the *Righteousness of God* in the right notion, and going about to establish in a contrary vein to the *Jews* a righteousness which is not their own but anothers, in the stead of that which it is not, they have not submitted to the truth, in this Doctrin of Justification.

And herein now (farther) does appear the ground of reconciliation between the Papists and us upon the point. For when the one and the other (let their Books be consulted) do go on the supposition that it is by the Law (the *Law of works*) that we are justified; this *Hypothesis* being removed, the opposition on both sides falls to the ground. That no man can bring or plead any such righteousness of his own before God as answers the Law, the Protestant must needs be in the right, and consequently if it were by the Law that we must stand or fall at his Tribunal, there was a necessity for their bringing in the righteousness of Christ made ours by faith (as they do) to justify us: but when indeed it is not so, when it is not (I say) by the Law, but by the *Covenant of Grace*, or by the *Gospel* that we are to be judged, it is some wonder to me, this plain truth should be no better understood. That Gods judging a man to have performed the condition of the covenant, is the accounting or declaring him righteous; and that Gods accounting a man righteous, is his justification. Let no man deceive you (says St John) he that doth righteousness, is righteous. That righteousness which makes a man righteous, and denominates him righteous, is that righteousness which makes God account him righteous. But this is the righteousness which he does. Note it, for it is express. And what

what righteousness is that? Why, Not the righteousness of Works which no man *des*: but the righteousness of the Gospel, that is in the stile of the other Apostle, a righteousness *without works* (to wit, without the works of the Law, or perfect works, in the sense he says also God justifies the *ungodly*) so that it is by *Grace*, while it is by this *Righteousness* (which does and must lean on the merits of Christ no less than we say Faith it self does) that we are justified and saved.

That the end of Christs coming into the world, of our Redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, was that we should be holy and righteous is said ordinarily by Divines according to the Scriptures, but the right and plain understanding or reason of what they say, is not said. *He hath chosen us in Christ that we should be holy. He hath redeemed us from iniquity that we should be a peculiar People. We are his workmanship created unto good works in (or through) Christ Jesus.* Well! when God made man at first and gave him a Law, was it not that he should live Holy? And when righteousness then was the end of his *Creation* and the Law thereof, how is this said to be the end of his *Redemption*? I answer therefore, Righteousness (or Holiness as they are one) we must know, does lye in a Conformity to the Law which God gives us. There is nothing else, and nothing less than this (the full performance of a Law given) that is Righteousness. Upon this account, as soon as man once fell and broke the Law of his Creation, it was impossible he should be righteous any more, unless there were a new Law brought in, in the performance whereof he might attain to that again which he had lost. Now to this end was it, that Christ came and died, this was the very main business (*I count*) of his Redemption, even the procuring this new Law, or another Law with lower terms, which some men performing, they do thereby become righteous, and so have righteousness, according to that Law, imputed to them for remission, and life Eternal. Here you see what that righteousness indeed is, which Christ is said to *bring in*, and in what sense he hath brought it in, or how such Texts (as those before) do attribute our Holiness to him. The obedience of Christs life and death, we know, was fulfilled on earth, and of this he himself hath once said, *It is finished*. But the righteousness he is said to *bring in*, is called an *Everlasting righteousness*. And what then can that be, but the righteousness of the Gospel, which upon the same account also is called the *Everlasting Gospel*? That is, because

cause it is by *this* righteousness in opposition to that of the *Law* (or the righteousness of *works*) that all men from the beginning of the world to the end of it, (and so is it to be accounted ever of force) do obtain everlasting Salvation.

I know the great difficulty of this Doctrine will lye on the point of remission. Our Divines do generally place justification in the remission of Sin; so do the *Papists* (with something else), and so have I my self after others. Nevertheless, as I remember *St Augustine* in one place does find fault with this In *Pelagius*: so hath the perplexity of it of late lead me into the like thoughts. The Truth is, Pardon of Sin is a *benefit* unto which the justified person is adjudged, as eternal life is: but remission of Sin must not be made the *formal reason* of justification. Our Divines might define justification to be an act of Grace whereby God gives us Eternal Life (or a right to it) as well as, *an act of grace whereby he pardons our sins*. That act, that very only act wherein the form of Justification does lye, is Gods accounting or pronouncing a man righteous, and this is a forensical act, according to Law, the Law, or Covenant of grace; Which Covenant promising *Forgiveness* and Life upon the performance of its Conditions, when a man hath performed them, he hath a right to those benefits, and when God does declare or account that a man hath performed them (which is all one as to judge him righteous), these benefits flow to him from that Judgment (or are conferr'd on him by that act) as *Effects* of that cause, and consequently cannot be the very act it self, which is the *cause* of them.

To forgive a mans sin, and declare him righteous, are two things inconsistent one with another in the same respect, and therefore when God pronounces a man just, it is according to the *Law of Faith*, and when he pardons his sin, it is in respect to the *Law of works*. And how then can two acts incompatible but in divers respects be made to enter one and the same definition?

It is true as all agree, that there are no works that man does, or can do, able to make God any amends for our offences, so that remission of sin must be attributed altogether to the merits of Christ in regard to the atonement made. But we must distinguish of Remission. Remission is either *Conditional* and *Universal* as it lyes in the Covenant, and is the purchase of Christ: or *Actual*, as it lyes in the application thereof to *particular* persons upon performance of the condition. When Divines do say we can do nothing

thing our selves for procuring reconciliation and remission, it is to be understood of Conditional universal remission. No mortal could do any thing toward the obtaining of that. *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself not imputing their trespasses.* But as for remission Actual, that man must be blind who sees not that God does every where require us to repent, believe, confess our faults, forsake them, do good works, forgive others, that we may have pardon, and be saved. Conditional pardon now is antecedent to mans justification, and contained in our Redemption. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of Sins.* Actual remission is subsequent to justification, for we must be supposed first to have performed the condition and be pronounced righteous, and then pardoned. When there is no remission than but what does either go before, or follow justification, it cannot be made the very act it self of our justification.

There is one Text may be opposed. *Even as David also described the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteousness without works, Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven.* It seems that the Righteousness which Paul speaks of without works in the one verse, is described by pardon in the other. This I my self have alledged, but upon farther consideration I answer. *The man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, or the blessedness of that man, is described:* but we may suppose, not *the Righteousness without works.* The scope of the Apostle is plainly to shew us only, that it is not by works of the Law, or such works as would make the reward of debt and not of grace (as appears in the immediate verses before) which are perfect works, that a man is justified. And he proves it by this argument, *because the man is blessed whose sins are forgiven;* that is as much as to say, not he who is without sin, but he who hath sin and it is forgiven. The man who is blessed is justified. But the man who is blessed hath sin to be forgiven. Therefore the righteousness which a man hath, or is imputed to him, is not a righteousness according to the Law of works (which are perfect without sin): but according to the Covenant of Grace (which are imperfect and need pardon). This I say is the scope of the place. *Not unto him that worketh (that is performs the perfect work of the Law, for none do) but unto him that believeth (to wit, with a true faith) on him that justifieth the*
ungodly

ungodly (that is legally, ungodly, or ungodly in reference to such works) his faith (which being true, & working by love, makes him yet Evangelically godly) is imputed to him for righteousness, that is, stands him in the stead as a perfect one would, through the acceptance of Grace. Gods imputing Righteousness to a person is indeed a Phrase signifying Gods accounting him righteous or justifying him: and the Apostle proves a man is justified without works, (that is perfect works) because he hath sin to be covered. I will yet repeat, The man to whom righteousness is imputed without works, is pardoned: but it follows not, that this Righteousness without works is pardon. To have righteousness imputed to a man without works, is all one as to have faith imputed to him for righteousness, so repentance or evangelical obedience, and that is not pardon, though these are never divided from the same subject. I will conclude therefore with that I have said once before, and will say it again at my parting with the point, that it is strange to me our protestant Divines should be so offward to this clear Determination. To wit, God judges (and will judge) all men according to the Gospel; Those who perform the condition of it, he accounts or pronounces righteous; They whom he accounts righteous, are justified. I will add, That, the righteousness of Christ which is the meritorious cause of our justification without dispute on all hands (that is the impulsive procatartick cause), which always comes under the Efficient, cannot for the same reason be the Formal, or Material cause of it. It is not the infusion of Righteousness with the Papist, which is our sanctification; nor the imputation of Christs righteousness with the Protestant, which is not to be understood but in genere cause Efficientis; nor remission of Sin, with Protestant and Papist; which I have now bin disproving: but the imputing to a Person his performance of the new covenant for righteousness, or the accounting or pronouncing him righteous according to that covenant, is the form, formal Cause, or formal Reason of his Justification. *

Do not think this strange, Justification (I will grant) virtually or Eminenter (as unum aggregatione) contains in it many things, and so remission among others (for we must find line to speak as Divines use): but Justification Formaliter (as unum simplex) I say, is only Gods pronouncing us Just (or sincere penitent believers), and remission is a benefit which in order of Nature does follow the performance of that condition.

Out of the Paper of *Perfection*.

BEfore I come to my present business, it is necessary that I set a little out of my way, which may else engender dispute, in my last paper. It is about pardon of sin, which I take to be the *effect*, not *formal Reason* of justification. *Pardon* (says Mr. Bradshaw) is *neither the whole, nor any essential part of justification, but only a contingent effect of it.* Treat. of Just. c. 8. To reckon a man just, or to impute to him righteousness, or deal with him as a righteous man, includes in it these two things, to lay nothing to his charge, and judge the reward due to him, that is (as to us) *Pardon*, and *Acceptance unto life*. Now these two things (I say) are included in it, but not as *Parts* of the thing, but as *Consequents* of it, and that separable from it. For suppose such a man as had never sinned, suppose *Adam* had not fell, he had been a righteous person, and God must have accounted him *righteous*, that is, *justified* him, but here could be no *Pardon*, so that it is manifest that pardon is separable from Justification, in the nature thereof, though we *actually* that are sinners, and are under wrath cannot be justified, but must be also pardoned. As for the reward of *Glory*, I cannot say if *Adam* had stood he should have had it; he should have been blessed in the happiness he enjoyed; I can say no more. In like manner I may instance in the Angels; they never fell, are holy and *righteous*, and so accounted of God, but there is no pardon in *Heaven*, or any other reward, but what they had, and are to have for ever.

Ainsi then, To *justify*, is, I hold, in the nature, or *formal reason* of it, *findon voulez* to account or declare one just. Whom *voulez* soever the Scripture consequently says was a just person, that person must be justified, for when the Word declares a man just, God does, whose word it is. Now look over the Scripture from *Genesis* to the Revelation, you shall have no body called a righteous or just person but upon the account of his upright walking with God. For this walking, *Elizabeth* is called a *Righteous Person*; but *Magdalen* who was pardoned is called a *Sinner*. And that by *Justification* the Apostle understands Gods accounting a man righteous, and not pardon I offer (from what was hinted) this Argument. When he disputes the question whether we are justified by faith or

or by *works*, he must understand the same thing by *Justification* while he ascribes it to *faith*, and when he denys it to *works*. But the Apostle cannot understand *pardon* by justification when he says we are not *justified by works*, because if we had those *works* which he means, there were no sin to pardon. The Apostle by *Works* understands such as the Law requires to justification that is *perfect works*, such as if one had them, would make the reward of *debt* and not of *grace*, and he says by the *Law* or by *Works* no man is justified, because no man performs it, no man does them. This being premised then in the Apostles resolution of the question, it is apparent that he cannot understand *pardon* by *justification*, because if he did so, there could be no question about the matter. There can be no question whether a man be *pardoned* who hath done those works as have no *sin* in them to *pardon*. I collect by the way, that to say a man is justified by *faith* and not *works*, is to say that God does *account a man righteous* (as he did *Abraham*) in regard to his *faith*; not deserts. He does account and deal with him as such, not upon his living according to the Law (*i. e.* *Works*) but his living according to the Gospel. By *faith*; that is by his embracing Christianity and living accordingly.

That a man must repent and believe (which is to perform the condition of the Covenant of Grace) in order of nature, before he be pardoned, is out of question.

That God accounts the Person a Performer who is so, arises of necessity, because his judgment is always according to Truth. Now when Gods accounting a man Righteous according to the Covenant (which is all one with his accounting him a penitent Believer, or performer of the condition) is *justifying* him as I say still, and pardon follows this, it appears to me that Remission must not be the *form* it self, or *part*, but the *effect* of justification. Nevertheless to avoid needless difference with Brethren, I will distinguish, and compose the matter. It is true, Remission is the effect, and no part of *this* justification: but there may be some *other* or further justification than this. Justification we agree to be a forensical act opposed to the laying any thing to a mans charge whereby he may be condemned. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that justifieth.* Now there is a double charge, the charge of the *Law*, that we are sinners, and so condemnable for the violation of it: And the charge of the *Gospel* that we have not per-

formed the remedying condition which God requires of us for the escaping that condemnation. Though it be an acquittal of us from the *latter* charge is that justification which every man is so much concerned to provide for, as that which depends upon the plea of what himself does, and the acquittal of us from the *former*, depends only on the plea of what Christ hath done for us, which can suffer no debate, I think, and so comes not into *Judgment*: yet will I not deny but Justification may be taken so *Comprehensively* as to contain in it our discharge from the *Law* also. There is a justification then in regard to a *Particular* charge, the charge of the *one*; or *Universal* justification against all accusation, or the charge of *Both*. As we must answer the charge of the Gospel by denying that charge, and pleading our performance; we answer the charge of the Law by confessing it, and pleading Christs satisfaction; that is, we acknowledge that we are guilty and have deserved Death, but yet that we are not condemnable because we are pardoned by the Law of Grace, through the Meritorious Righteousness and Sacrifice of Christ Jesus, supposing such a charge can find place before our Law-giver. Our Faith and Repentance is our Righteousness in regard to the Gospel; but pardon of sin, together with this righteousness, may go both into *Universal* justification. I cannot indeed but say still, that ~~that~~ justification which is *Particular* in regard to the Gospel-Charge, seems to me to be the justification which St Paul and James mainly intend, if not altogether; for when the one says we are justified by Faith, and the other by works also, and both prove it from one and the same Text, that Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness: I pray what else can justification be with either, but Gods imputing evangelical obedience to a person for Righteousness; that is, Gods accounting of him righteous upon his believing, repenting, or performing the condition of the Gospel? *Simplicissimum nobis videtur si dicamus, fidem justificare, quia credenti sua fides imputetur ad justitiam. Fides autem ad justitiam imputari dicitur, quia Deus illum quia viva fide in Christum credit pro justo habet & reputat, eum a pena peccati liberans, & ad vitam aeternam acceptans, propter Christi mortem & obedientiam.* The Judicious Le Blanc.

That the Apostles *Righteousness without Works*, and *Pardon*, is not the same (and consequently that the one is a probation and not a description of the other as I noted upon reflection), must be granted by those who make both these to be parts of our justifi-

fication, for such is the nature of parts to be diverse one from another. *Hac est natura partium ut unum corpus diversa componant.* Boethius. de Conf. l. 3. p. 3. Again, *Quod a qualibet re diversum est, id non est illud a quo intelligitur diversum.* It must be also confessed by me, that the diversity of *Two* things, as the cause and effect, does not hinder those things to be parts of another *Third* which is the *compositum* of both; and consequently that Gods justifying us by this *Righteousness* (that is by *Faith* or Evangelical Obedience, *without the works of the Law*), and then Pardoning us, as the effect of that act, may both make up the *Compositum* of *Universal* Justification.

And now let me tell the Reader, there has passed two long private Letters apiece between Mr. Baxter and me about this point, and we have brought our conference to this close: God having for Christs merits and sacrifice made a Grant of Pardon, Grace and Glory to all true Penitent Believers; we must first have the Particular Justitia Conditionis, or be justifiable against the charge of impenitency and unbelief, that so we may have right to Pardon, farther Grace and Glory, or *us ad impunitatem & ad Regnum cœlorum*, and be justifiable against the charge, That we are Sinners, Damnable, and have no right to Heaven. There needs no more than these words (says Mr. Baxter) for a plain understanding the whole matter. And so (no Controversie remaining here *in re*, but *in nomine* only) I will break off, and be concluded.

Out of the Paper called *Peaceable Disquisitions*.

HAVING read Dr. Owens book of Justification, I am not satisfied with what he hath offered for the reconciliation of St James and Paul on that subject. This is the reason I suppose (that is, the most solid) why so many do choose here of late to go with the *Mediocrian*, or steer the *middle way*, in that point. I perceive that Dr Tully with our first Reformed Divines, and this excellent Doctor, are for distinguishing of *Faith*, and *Justification*, but will not let us, by no means, distinguish of *Works* for the reconciliation of the Apostles. I do wonder at this. The Apostle James and the Apostle Paul do both agree, that we are justified by Faith. The one says, *we conclude*
that

that a man is justified by Faith; and the other says also, it is by Faith: Their seeming difference is only about works, when one says by Faith without Works, and the other, by Faith and Works also. And how then comes it to pass that we must not distinguish of Works, but of Justification, and Faith, to compose the difficulty?

I will offer the Doctor therefore here one Argument, under his favour, which shall be but one, and that not as others have, (so far as I know) for then it were like he had already weighed it. It is this: That Justification which St Paul speaks of, is that Justification which we have in that Text of *Genesis*, where it is said, *And Abraham believed, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness*. Or, That Justification Paul speaks of, is that Imputation of Faith for righteousness which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. But that Justification which St James speaks of, is that Justification which we have in that Text in *Genesis*; or, is that Imputation of Faith for Righteousness, as is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. Therefore St Paul's justification, and St James Justification are the same Justification. Again, That Faith which St Paul speaks of, is the Faith that is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*, or the same Faith as was imputed to Abraham for righteousness in that place. But that Faith which St James speaks of is the same Faith which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*; or, the same Faith that was imputed to Abraham for righteousness in that place. Therefore the faith that St Paul speaks of, and the faith which St James speaks of, is the same faith also. Now when the Faith is the same, and the Justification the same, we must distinguish of Works then out of question, to reconcile these Scriptures.

Of Works then let us distinguish; and the distinction is this. There are Works which are inconsistent with Grace and Pardon; so that if we had them, we should have no need of Christ's righteousness or sacrifice, but the doing of them would make the reward to be of debt, or make life to be due out of strict justice, (*He that doeth them shall live in them*). That is, Works which the Law requires unto Justification. And these are the Works St Paul speaks of, and the reasons which he alledges why we are not justified by these Works is, because no man hath them. This is that which he apparently urges (for he ascends in his dispute from the Law of Moses, to the Law of Nature, which concerns both Jew and Gentile) in his three first Chapters to the *Romans*; so that if a-

Any man be justified, it must be *without* them. Therefore we conclude (says he) that by faith *without them* (that is without having them) a man is justified. There are then Works also which are consistent with Pardon & Mercy though we have them, so that when we have done these, we do need the righteousness and satisfaction of our Redeemer to cover their imperfection, and for acceptance of our persons, no less than if we had Faith alone without any, and these are Works of sincerity required of us in the Gospel.

It is no ways derogatory, I say, to Gods Grace and Christ's Merits, for a man to be justified by these works, any more than to be justified by Faith alone, in regard to Debt or Merit, upon which account St Paul excludes works in his disputation. It is of *these Works* I must say, (as the Apostle says it is of *Faith*) that it may be of *Grace*. And these are the Works St James speaks of, when he says, *By Faith and Works also*; that is all one as by a *Faith working by Love*, in Pauls words elsewhere. And the being justified by *Faith working by Love*, or by a Faith productive of Works, or by these *Works and Faith* also (which being such Works as fall short of the Law, and do need grace and forgiveness for their acceptance with God) is all one with St Pauls by Faith *without works of the Law*, or without such as the Law requires unto justification. Thus are Paul and James reconciled, and so you find it in my *Middle Papers*.

I will Advance hence then my former Argument. That justification by Faith without works which St Paul speaks of, is that Justification, or that Imputation of *Abrahams Faith* for righteousness, which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. But that justification by Works and Faith also, which St James speaks of, is that Justification or that Imputation of *Abrahams faith* for righteousness, which is spoken of in that Text in *Genesis*. Therefore St Pauls justification by faith without works, and St James justification by faith and works also, or by *works and not by faith only*, is the same in the two Apostles.

The *medium* upon which all three Syllogisms depend, is the Apostles citing the same Text, both of them, for that which either of them assert, while one says *by faith without works*, and the other *by works and not by faith only*. The *major* and *minor* therefore in all three are undeniable; and in the *Conclusion* of the last, I am sure the Doctor and I shall agree together.

To Mr. Williams.

THere was a Letter I wrote to you upon the coming out of your last Book, a Coppy whereof being taken by the hand that carried it to the Post, and given me again newly to Peruse, I will put it to the end of these Papers, with the liberty of amplification.

To be made Righteous by Christs Obedience, is, say you, 1. To be made free from Condemnation, and to be Intituled to Eternal Life. 2. To be ~~be~~ made Holy through the Spirit or infused righteousness, whereby we believe, repent, and perform the condition for obtaining that right. I use not your very words, the sense being one.

That by Christs Righteousness, we are made Righteous so as to be freed from condemnation, is what is generally received; but to be made righteous by his obedience so as to be regenerated by it, is disputable, if true; or to have Christs Righteousness imputed to us for justification, is what we say commonly: but to have it imputed to us for Conversion, Regeneration, Sanctification, is odd, and needs explanation.

Your meaning is, Jesus Christ by what he hath done and suffered for us, hath purchased for the Elect, Faith, Repentance, or our Infused righteousness, as well as Pardon and Life, and so by his obedience we are made Evangelically righteous as well as justified. But this is a Scheme I look on as incongruous with free reason (though our Divines accustom themselves to say so), because there goes to Mans Salvation more, I hope than Christs redemption. There is *Election* hath its part, and *Redemption* its part: There is the hand of the *Father* in it, the work of the *Son*, and the operation of the *Holy Ghost*; and these parts must not be confounded. God loves the World and gives his Son: Christ comes, and by his death procures redemption for all; so that upon condition of their faith they may be saved: The Holy Ghost works that faith or condition in the Elect, and so they are saved.

The Work of Redemption reaches no farther than to free us from the Law or Condemnation upon condition; for Redemption is but Redemption, and *Universal*, and must not be consequently one thing for the *World*, and another for the *Elect*. Redemption

redemption having done its part; that is, procured Salvation unto all on condition: Election now does its part in providing for some the Condition. Our Divines are still saying indeed, that Christs Redemption must not be held such, as that when the work is done it might be possible that none yet might be saved; & so he dye in vain; but it is really an idle complaint, for Election takes care of that. To wit, I say, when Redemption hath done its work, rendring all men Salvable on condition, This takes care that there are some shall be sure to perform that Condition (Believe, Repent, Persevere) and be saved. And so we give to each of them their own proper work in the Oeconomy of our Salvation. The first *Grace* (it lyes in my thoughts), as Christ himself; is given freely, and not bought for any; and the condition in the spring, and the first grace being one, though Christ hath not purchased the Condition for the Elect (which as the *immediate* fruit of Redemption he hath not), it does not lye on their own *free will* for all that.

Let us take heed (as my self have it elsewhere) how we order our conceptions in the matter of our Salvation, that we set not God aside as *Rektor* or *Lord*, in it. We must not advance and justifie his *Rektorship* so as to exclude his *Lordship*; nor so advance and justifie his *Lordship* as to exclude his *Rektorship* in the business. On one hand, those Persons that hold Christ dyed for all, procuring Salvation on Condition, but leave the Condition on mans free will (or on a co-operating with general Grace, procured as some say, thereby), they do excellently illustrate Gods *Rektorship*, and justifie him in dealing with us, according to *Gospel-Law*, but they exclude his *Lordship*: As on the other hand, they that hold Christ dyed only for the *Elect*, purchasing the *Condition* as well as the *Benefit*, and that there is no *Covenant* but what is *Absolute*; they do excellently advance Gods *Lordship*, but in effect do exclude his *Rektorship* from having a hand in *Man's Salvation*. But as for those Persons now that hold, Christ hath dyed for *All*, in purchasing pardon and salvation on *Condition*; but that the Condition flows not from the Power or Co-operation of *Man's free will*, nor directly from *Christs purchase*, but from *Election*; these do most manifestly give God his glory, both as *Rektor* and *Lord*; while they make him as *Lord* to give the *Condition* to his *Elect*, and as *Rektor* to judge of *them*, as of all the *World*, according to that *Condition*.

For your former way of being made righteous, by Gods giving a believer (as you say) right to pardon and acceptance with God unto life, which is by *imputing to us Christs righteousness in the fruit and effects*, I pray why did you not stick to that? What need any fear or vindication to make you adde that *Besides those effects being made ours, the very righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers?* When these good men say, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed, they understand that Christ in *Law-sense*, or in the person of the *elect*, did satisfy the penalty of the law, and perfectly obeyed it, so that the believer himself may be said, and reckoned of God to have made satisfaction, and obeyed in his *surety*, whereby a right to pardon, and life is his, no less than if he had done it himself. What say you now to them? You and we all do grant, that what Christ hath done and suffered for us, is not only *homo nostro*, but *loco nostro*; that is, in our stead, so far, that we shall have the benefit or the fruit of it all one as if we had satisfied and obeyed our selves; If besides these fruits or effects, Christs righteousness is made ours, or imputed in any further sense than so, it lyes upon you to shew in what, and what difference there is (even such as you are able to make out for a plain man to understand) between you and them; that is, the difference between Christs having satisfied and obeyed the Law for our sakes, so as to be in our stead, and yet not so as we may be reckoned of God, in *Law-sense*, as if our selves had performed it; which is indeed to be as righteous even in regard to the Law of Works, as our *surety*; for in that righteousness which is the *same*, there can be neither inequality, or comparison. I see not but if you grant the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us any otherwise or more than in its effects, it must needs come at last to no less than this; and then you boggle, and have yielded your cause to your Adversary.

Christs righteousness (say you) may be considered as the full performance of the conditions of the Covenant of Redemption, which included a full conformity to the law of works: and an adjudged right to the promised reward for his performance of these conditions. Now both these are imputed to a believer on consideration of Gods giving a believer a right to pardon and life. By these words I think you intended the explanation of your notion; but when you know that a right to pardon and life (which is the gift of God we own through Christs merits) is a fruit and effect of Christs righteousness, how can

can the full performance you mention, which is *Christ's Righteousness* *in self*, be given to any under the consideration of that which is an effect thereof? It is imputed, or given, in regard to its Effects: but how *besides* is it given? I deny, *that the full performance of the Covenant of Redemption* can be imputed (with this *Besides*) to any mortal, it being proper to Christ, and belonging to him only: and consequently there is nothing in our behalf but the reward promised (that is a right to pardon, and life in the main) that can be given the believer, nor can his righteousness be imputed to any, but in regard to the *benefit* only.

After this, the great point to be debated with Mr. M. that serious Antagonist, should be about the *Righteousness of God*, what the Apostles does indeed mean by *that*. You have not seen five sheets of mine printed long since, nor Mr. *Clark's* unprinted late book. If you had, or have, or have not, who knows, God only knows, whither you being here so mealy mouth'd, and not *speaking out*, which I think you ought, as for the truth, when the time so much requires it, did give him just cause to let you fall into that exasperation, and offence of these Brethren which you sought *thereby* to avoid. Whereas let me tell you, when I meeting once with Dr. *Owen*, and Sir *Charles Wolesley* together, and they were speaking for the Doctrine of Justification, especially Sir *Charles*, very keenly, I plainly told them, that I was of another judgment, which I shewed them in putting then out these sheets here reprinted. Sir *Charles* told me afterwards, he had read them twenty times over, and turning *Mediocrian* himself, he wrote his book our way, on this Subject, which you having seen, can't be excused: The Doctor Candidly signified to me that he could bear with *me* (or such as me) in the difference; and (though one chapter in my *Disquisitions* is namedly against him) he never shewed any Offence, or offered any Vindication.

Well! Let us consult hereupon what is that *righteousness of God*, St Paul speaks of *Rom. 1. 17. Rom. 3. 21, 26. 2 Cor. 1. 27. Phil. 3. 9.* which he calls so; GOD's righteousness, the righteousness of *faith*, that which is *through the faith of Christ*, the righteousness which is of God by *faith*, in opposition to *works* in the point of Justification? Is it the righteousness of *Christ*, who is God, and therefore called *the righteousness of God*? I am persuaded that this is a first thought, so shallow, that it must be short. What then indeed is it? This Righteousness of God, is *that way*
and

and method of becoming righteous, which is of Gods infinitum. So Mr. Clark before mentioned in his *Immortalization*, on Rom. 1. 19. That is, not the righteousness of Christ, but that righteousness through Christ (accepted as such through him), which is ordained of God, and so promulgated, in the Gospel. But what way and method is that?

When God made man, we must conceive he had in his prospect what to do with him; and that was to glorify himself in saving him. There was two ways to do this, either by the way of *Works*, or *Grace*. Man was created with an Original Righteousness, and what was Original must be *Natural*, and if he had stood, he must according to *Nature* have been righteous, and all his posterity; and the reward then (as it is reckoned by the Apostle) would have been of *deeds or merits*, and not of grace. God hereby should have glorified his justice and goodness in saving man, but he should have shewn no mercy, nor man have any need of it; no, nor any need of a Saviour, or Redemption, or the holy Spirits operation: that is, of that grace which is medicinal, or habitual grace, for I say, if he had an original righteousness, he had no need of the infusion of a new, to heal original corruption. He would have been saved by works proceeding from nature, *Ex regna, & virtus Naturæ*, and not from grace or the Spirit, and have needed none of that grace neither which is favour, but only Gods justice to have dealt with him according to that law of innocency, which he had performed. God therefore did not choose this way, that man should be saved by a righteousness of his own according to nature; but by the way of *grace*, and works proceeding from grace, or the Holy Spirit, and not of himself; and that is, by a righteousness, which is of God by faith. For by grace are you saved through faith, and that not of your selves, lest any man should boast. That is, as much as to say, not by a righteousness of your own contriving, making or effecting, but of Gods own contrivance, who hath chosen this way rather than that of works, that none may ascribe that to themselves, which is due only to God. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of water, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. Note, here is the righteousness we have done, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, so opposed as that we are saved by that righteousness, which is of God, and of Gods spirit, and not by that which is our own. How is that? Why, they being ignorant of Gods righteous-

of *unbelief*, and going about to establish their own, have not submitted to
 that, which should have saved them. The performance of the
 Law of *Moses*, was the *Jew* righteousness; for God says, *this shall*
be your righteousness, and the performance of the Law of Nature,
 or Covenant of works, is all *man*kind's righteousness; and when
 neither Jew could perform the one, and no mortal but Christ, the
 other; there are none can be saved by the righteousness of their
 own, but it must be by another righteousness called by the Apostle,
 the Righteousness of God. But now the righteousness of God without
 the law is manifest, being witnessed by the Law and Prophets, even the
 righteousness of God, which is by the faith of *Jesus Christ*. Hence is
 a righteousness that was ever on foot in the world (or none else
 could have been saved) but now revealed by the Gospel, which
 is the righteousness that saves us in opposition to the righteou-
 sness of the law, or of works, even the righteousness of faith;
 that is, a righteousness according to the Law of Grace, or Cova-
 nant of Grace, which Christ hath procured for us by his Blood.
 Hence do we read, it is said, of Christ in *David*, that as he should
 make reconciliation for iniquity, so he should bring in an everlasting
 righteousness; that is, he should by his death procure a Covenant,
 or Law of Grace, by our performance whereof (without the Law)
 we are righteous, and must be justified and saved. 'Tis that in
 this righteousness. If Christ had not procured for us this new
 law, there could have been no righteousness in the earth; for the
 law of innocency no man can perform, and therefore hath he by
 procuring this new Covenant, brought in a righteousness into the
 world; and that which is the abiding righteousness, the righteou-
 sness of this Covenant, whereby all are saved, that have, or ever
 shall be saved. Now when we have here a righteousness which
 lies in performance of the Law of Grace, purchased for us by
 Christ, and wrought in us by the Spirit of Grace (for the Spirit
 we must know is not given to perform the law of works, but *this*
 law) we do see what does belong to this way of grace, which God
 hath chosen to save man by. This way of Grace does contain in
 it the giving Christ, the Redemption we have by him, our recon-
 ciliation with God, pardon of sin, the Covenant it self, and the
 dispensation of the Spirit, or his grace, for performing the con-
 dition of it. All this and more hangs together, so that when we
 say it is not by works, but by grace, that we are saved, it is all one
 as to say, it is not by perfect works, but an Evangelical righteou-
 ness,

nast, by Mercy; by Pardon, by Christ. See what this *Righteousness of God* comes to in its right and full definition.

And what now is the *Law of Grace* which we so often mention, and by the way, what the *Election of Grace*? From that it said, I am often prone to think, that the *Election of Grace* is really at the bottom nothing but this; to wit, Gods choosing this way and method, the method and way of *Grace*, and not of *Works*, in the saving of Man. A choice of the way of saving Men, rather than of *whom* he saves. I do not lay down this as my opinion, but offer it to consideration. *He hath chosen us in Christ* (says the Apostle) *before the foundation of the World*. Election then is in *Christ*. How that is, according to the common notion of Election, is over hard to conceive; but take it in this position, and here is even day-light. For the *Law of Grace*, there is no such kind of difficulty; it is all one with the *Gospel*. A Law is the declaration of the will of the Law-giver; and this *Law of Grace* then, or the *Gospel*, (which I say are one) is the declaration of this *Way and Method* that God hath chose for Man's *Salvation*.

God *wait in Christ* (says the Text) *reconciling the world to himself*, not imputing their trespasses; and hath committed to us the *Word of Reconciliation*. That *Word* is the *Gospel*, declaring to the world this reconciliation or pardon which Christ hath purchased for it. The pardon is general, and a standing pardon passed in Heaven as a pardon that passes in Parliament. An Act of Grace (for this is the conception we must have of it) passes the Houses and King, the people do nothing toward the obtaining of it, and is its general; nevertheless, if any come to have the benefit of this pardon, he must look into the Act, and see how it runs; he must be qualified according to the Act, or he loses the benefit. It is verily so in this Act of Grace, or Pardon, for mankind. It is an Act of Grace, I say, perfectly free to man. No one can do any thing for the atoning God, or meriting from Him. It is all from the love of the Father, in sending his Son, and his Son fulfilling the Law, and suffering for us; that it is granted, and in this sense (as to the pardon in general, and the means procuring it) those Divines that say the Covenant of Grace is without conditions, may be justified. When yet if any come in particular for the benefit of this Pardon, *Act of Grace, Grant, Law, Covenant, Testament* (for this *Grant of Pardon* or

coined by Christ, the *Covenant* or *Testament* of Christ; which is his will, bequeathing what he hath purchased upon his own Terms, are all we know but the same thing; he must read the *Will*, and see how it is palled, or read over the *Will*, and see how it is *will'd*, he must go to the *Roll*, which is the Word of God (it was decreed from Eternity, it passed at Christ's death, it was enrolled in Gods Word, and promulgated by the Ministers of it), and there he will find that God requires of every man to Believe, Repent, and walk Sincerely before him, in order to have the benefit; which if he do not, he is to have none by it; so that in this, which is the *common sense*, every one must see that the Covenant hath conditions. The Pardon belongs to all, and Christ dyed for all: but the benefit of the pardon, and of Christ's death, comes only to his Sheep that *Hear his voice* and believe in him. This states that most agitated point of *Redemption*; which I think so, with another passage before, to borrow out of a Paper of mine, printed much later than my former *Middle way Papers*, without the Authors name to it; it was Entitled, *A Private Paper touching the Universality of Redemption, the conditionality of the Covenant of Grace, and our freedom from the Law of Works*. I did not put in either passage in the Original I wrote to you, for, you having seen that, it was needless to you: but now I print it, it is needful for others. For when my aim is only at the investigation of Light or Truth, and the publick profit, I am never out of my way, so long, as I am in the middle way, still in these Determinations.

One thing yet I must add, that I am, and cannot but be offended much in my mind, that when it pleased God to raise up such a Man as Mr Baxter (whose constant Piety and Integrity towards him, and Profoundness in Divinity, hath scarce a parallel amongst the chiefest Divines, English or Our-Landish, who have preceded him) to make the reconciling our Protestant differences, (those about the *Five Points*, and this about *Justification*, and the like) his very business, so as that he hath brought them to appear either as good as none at all, or so small and little as to be tolerable. There is a Company of our Brethren at present, that are for reviving and making so much again of them, as if they sought to bury that peace he sought, and fight he hath offered, and took, with his Person; regarding him no more than one that had never been, or had wrote nothing about these mat-

ters;

ters; which they do also with a spirit so partial towards our
 first REFORMERS, because such, as to be pertinacious
 even in their alterations. I am (I say) offended at this,
 and so far indeed of another kind, that let *Adrian Barter* say
 what he will, and *John Calvin* say what he will, say, the Assem-
 bly of Divines, while it moves in their *grave Confessions and Ca-*
techisms: and more than that, let the *Synod of Dort* also say what
 it will, they are but men, and I will not Captivate my Under-
 standing to any of them; For this I am sure, that all of them,
 and I, are out still in one thing or other, and will be so to the
 end of the World.

Your loving Friend,

F. I. N. I. S.

E. R. R. A. T. A.

Page 4. Line 99 for *am. r. cum. p. 230. l. 35. f. 42. r. di. p. 30. l. 20.* *am. r.*
 wanting. *r. make him a finner. p. 33. l. 22. f. of r. or. p. 47. l. 28. f. rous-*
sur r. p. 49. l. 34. f. p. 49. l. 34. f. p. 49. l. 34. f. p. 49. l. 34. f. p. 49. l. 34. f.

There was Four Papers of the Authors, called the *Middle Way*;
 whereof this of *Justification* being Sold off, the rest could not be
 put together: But this being Reprinted, these Four Papers, with
 that of *Peccant Disquisitions*, may be had Bound in one Book, ac-
 cording to the Advertisement in the *Catalogue of Books* ensuing.

T. P.